

**U
M
A
Š
I
N
S
K
O**

**IN THE ENGINE ROOM:
CONDITIONS OF WORKING IN CULTURE 2 /**

Presentation of the results
of artists' residency project
and discussion with
Bojana Piškur
and Đorđe Balmazović

M ODELJENJU:

USLOVI RADA U KULTURI 2 /

Prezentacija rezultata umetničke rezidencije
u okviru projekta "Raskršća Istok Zapad"

i razgovor sa
Bojanom Piškur i
Đorđem Balmazovićem

Tekstovi učesnika i učesnica debate
u Kulturnom centru REX 29. januara 2013
Essays by participants in the debate held in
Rex Cultural Centre on January 29th 2013

Sadržaj / Contents

Uvod / Introduction	4 / 7
Najava debate / Debate Announcement	8 / 10
Bojana Piškur Radnička anketa; Debata i prezentacija u Rex-u, 29. januar 2013	12
Worker's Inquiry; Debate and Presentation, Rex, 29th of January 2013	16
Zoran Pantelić Osvrt	19
Review	21
Saša Pančić Kultura radničkih simulakruma	24
The Culture of Workers' Simulacra	27
Marijana Cvetković Otudjenje od sopstvenog rada - kultura u Srbiji danas	31
Alienation from work in culture in Serbia today	33
Marko Miletić Nekoliko komentara o mogućnostima borbe za bolji položaj radnika u kulturi	35
A Few Comments About the Possibilities of Struggle for a Better Position of Cultural Workers	38

Jelena Vesić 41 / 45

Inga Zimprich
Kako (mi, kulturni radnici) debatujemo 52
How we (cultural workers), debate 55

Sönke Hallmann
The formats we choose 58
Formati koje biramo 61

Céline Larrère 64 / 67

KRATKE BIOGRAFIJE / SHORT CVs 70



Moja je dužnost, kao urednika ovog izdanja, da predložim čitaocima da pre publikacije koju su upravo radoznalo ili mrzovoljno otvorili, pročitaju:

- publikaciju Bojane Piškur i Đorđa Balmazovića (naslovljenu "Radnička anketa") nastalu tokom njihovog rezidencija, gde će naći neke karakteristične izvode iz intervjua;

- prvu publikaciju/svesku iz cele ove serije, naslovljenu "Uslovi rada u kulturi", koja je nastala na osnovu nekoliko susreta i razgovora o datoj temi u Kulturnom centru Rex.

A da nakon ove tri (navedene dve i ove koju držite u rukama) obavezno pročitaju i publikaciju Bojane Piškur i Đorđa Balmazovića, nastalu nakon obrade rezultata ankete ("Kratka analiza radničke ankete").

Pretpostavljajući da će malo ko imati strpljenja i volje da traži i čita navedene materijale po ovoj komplikovanoj šemi, pokušaću da svim zainteresovanima ujedno olakšam eventualno predstojeće čitanje, a na neki način "opravdam" i odbijanje ili, čak, nemogućnost čitanja.

Radnici u kulturi nisu klasa po sebi, zato i ne mogu ni lako ni lagodno artikulirati zajedničke interese, ni svoje, a po svemu sudeći ni interese drugih klasa po sebi ili za sebe. Razgovor nakon kojeg su pisani utisci sabrani u ovoj publikaciji, ali i prethodni razgovori u Rexu sa istom ili sličnom tematikom, bili su neka vrsta kompleksnog dokaznog postupka za tu nelakost i nelagodnost.

Ali svi oni, tj. svi mi, "radnici i radnice u kulturi" možemo svesno, "za sebe" takvu artikulaciju ili izbegavati ili na njoj insistirati. Možemo i neodgovorno unositi konfuziju u polje interpretacije kulturnih i političkih

praksi i referenci. U svakom slučaju, izbegavanje artikulacije političkih interesa ne može se razumeti kao neutralnost jer je neutralnost po pravilu na strani vladajuće ideologije ili ideologije vladajućih. Unošenje nelagode ili čak konfuzije u stanje i principe takvog izbegavanja po može postati emancipatorski čin. A oko toga šta je emancipacija i čemu ona vodi pojedince/ke i njihove neformalne grupe, zvanične asocijacije ili čitave društvene klase možemo i moramo makar započeti nove razgovore.

Urednik

Introduction

It is my duty, as the editor of this edition, to suggest to the readers that, before reading the publication they have just opened with presumed curiosity or despondence, they try reading the following:

- the publication by Bojana Piškur and Đorđe Balmazović (titled "Worker's Survey") created during their residency as a part of the project Engine room Europe, where they will find some excerpts that are characteristic of interviews conducted with workers in culture in Serbia;
- the first publication/volume in this series, titled "The Conditions of Working in Culture" ensuing from several meetings and discussions regarding this topic that were held in the Rex Cultural Centre;
- also, after these three (two aforementioned, as well as the one you are holding in your hands right now), they should definitely read the publication by Bojana Piškur and Đorđe Balmazović, created after their analysis of the results of the survey ("A Short Analysis of the Worker's Survey").

Presumably, few will have the patience and the willpower to seek out and read through aforementioned materials following this complex pattern, so I will try to make any potentially forthcoming reading easier, but also to "justify" in some way its refusal or impossibility.

Workers in culture are not a class in itself and this is why they cannot easily or comfortably articulate any sort of common interest, not their own, and it would seem, neither those of other classes themselves or for themselves. The discussions that have resulted in impressions written for this publication, but also previous discussions held in Rex on this or

similar topics, were a sort of a complex presentation of evidence for this uneasiness and discomfort.

But, all of them, i.e. all of us "culture workers" can consciously "for us" either avoid or insist on this sort of articulation. We can irresponsibly be the cause of much confusion in the field of interpretation of cultural and political practices and references. In any case, avoiding articulation of political interests cannot be understood as neutrality, because neutrality is by default on the side of the ruling ideology or the ideology of those who rule. Introducing discomfort or even confusion into the very core principles of this state of avoidance can become an act of emancipation. And, regarding the question of what emancipation is and to what will it lead individuals and their informal groups, official associations or entire societal classes, we could and we should at least initiate new conversations.

Editor

U MAŠINSKOM ODELJENJU: USLOVI RADA U KULTURI 2

29. 01. 2013, 18:00

Prezentacija rezultata umetničke rezidencije u okviru projekta "Raskršća Istok Zapad" i razgovor sa Bojanom Piškur i Đorđem Balmazovićem

Bojana Piškur, članica Kolektiva za radikalnu edukaciju (Radical Education Collective) i kustoskinja Moderne galerije u Ljubljani, boravila je od 24. septembra do 3. oktobra u Beogradu, u rezidencijalnom programu u okviru projekta Raskršća Istok Zapad. Ona je svoj boravak iskoristila za nastavak dosadašnjih i započinjanje novih istraživanja i diskusija na temu rada i položaja ovdašnjih radnika i radnica u kulturi. Koristeći upitnik koji je napravila zajedno sa svojim kolegicama iz Workers' Inquiry Group (<http://www.rex.b92.net/en/Flashback/story/3944/In+the+engine+room:+working+c>) kao sredstvo za svoje istraživanje, intervjuisala je 12 osoba koje aktivno učestvuju na kulturnoj sceni u Srbiji, kuratore/ke, umetnike/ce, aktiviste i aktivistkinje, i iz nezavisnog i javnog sektora: Daria Milenkovića (Alternativni kulturni centar Niš i AKO Novi Sad), Marka Miletića (Kontekst kolektiv), Nebojšu Milikića (Kulturni centar REX), Radmilu Joksimović (nezavisna kuratorica), Aleksandru Sekulić (Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju), Jelenu Vesić (nezavisna kuratorica), Vladana Jeremića (umetnik, programski urednik u Fondaciji Roza Luksemburg), Renu Raedle (umetnica, Biro Beograd kolektiv), Zorana Erića (kurator u Muzeju savremene umetnosti), Zorana Pantelića (umetnik i aktivista, Kuda.org, Novi Sad), Mariju Raletić (honorarna radnica u Muzeju istorije Jugoslavije) i Sašu Pančića (samostalni umetnik). Intervjui sa njima su

snimani i deo su nastajuće arhive projekta. Ovo ispitivanje je i nastavak istraživanja Workers Inquiry Group iz Španije, kao i aktivnosti Kulturnog centra Rex na dokumentaciji i analizi položaja radnika i radnica u kulturi u Srbiji.

Đorđe Balmazović (umetnik i aktivista, ŠKART kolektiv) je sarađivao sa Bojanom Piškur na ovom istraživačkom projektu. Njihova stečena iskustva, dokumentacija i plan za postprodukciju kojima će se predstaviti rezultati istraživanja, biće prezentovani na ovom razgovoru.

Dosadašnja istraživanja i debate na ovu temu, realizovani u Kulturnom centru Rex, dokumentovani su na stranicama

<http://rexpro.b92.net/mvm/ntano.html> i http://rexpro.b92.net/mvm/engineerom_eng.html.

U razgovoru nakon prezentacije učestvovali su intervjuisani radnici i radnice u kulturi, kao i kolege i kolegice iz inostranstva koji će pokušati da uporede svoja sa ovdašnjim uslovima i iskustvima rada u kulturi: Inga Zimprich (Nemačka), Sonke Hallmann (Nemačka) i Céline Larrère (Francuska).

Razgovor će moderirati Marijana Cvetković.

Ovaj rezidencijalni program i istraživanje su deo programske linije interkulturnih dijaloga Raskršća istok-zapad (Crossroads East-West) u okviru trogodišnjeg projekta "Mašinsko odeljenje Evropa" (Engine Room Europe) koji Kulturni centar Rex/Fond B92 realizuje sa još jedanaest kulturnih centara Evrope. Projekat je fokusiran na nezavisne radnike u kulturi i njihovo polje delovanja, a njegov glavni je razvoj kapaciteta i održivosti nezavisne kulture u Evropi. Projekat Engine Room Europe je podržan od strane Evropske komisije, a programska linija interkulturnih dijaloga Raskršća istok-zapad i od Ministarstva kulture Republike Srbije.

Debata se realizuje u okviru Govornih programa Kulturnog centra Rex, koji je podržan od strane Fonda za otvoreno društvo.

IN THE ENGINE ROOM: CONDITIONS OF WORKING IN CULTURE 2

Cultural Center REX
29. 01. 2013, 18:00

Bojana Piškur, member of the Radical Education Collective and custodian at Modern Gallery Ljubljana, participated in the Engine Room Europe project residency programme in Belgrade, from 24 September to 3 October. Her stay in Belgrade was focused both on continuing her previous research efforts and undertaking new ones, concerning the activities and the position of local cultural workers. Using the questionnaire that she developed, together with her colleagues from the Workers' Inquiry Group (<http://www.rex.b92.net/en/Flashback/story/3944/In+the+engine+room:+working+c>), as a tool for her research, she interviewed twelve people actively participating in the activities in the cultural scene in Serbia, curators, artists and activists from the independent and public sector: Dario Milenković (Alternative Cultural Centre Niš and AKO Novi Sad), Marko Miletić (Kontekst Collective), Nebojša Milikić (Cultural Centre REX), Radmila Joksimović (independent curator), Aleksandra Sekulić (Centre for Cultural Decontamination), Jelena Vesić (independent curator), Vladan Jeremić (artist, Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung programme editor), Rena Rädle (artist, Biro Beograd Collective), Zoran Erić (curator at the Museum of Contemporary Art), Zoran Pantelić (artist and activist, Kuda.org, Novi Sad), Marija Raletić (part-time employee at the Museum of Yugoslav History) and Saša Pančić (independent artist). The interviews have been recorded and make part of the project archive. This research is also a continuation of the investigation conducted by the Workers Inquiry Group from Spain and is part of the project team effort to document and analyse the position of cultural

workers in Serbia.

Dorđe Balmazović (artist and activist, ŠKART Collective) collaborated with Bojana Piškur on this research-oriented project. The experiences they gained, documentation and post-production plan will be shown at this discussion.

Previous research and debates on this topic are documented on the following pages <http://rexpro.b92.net/mvm/ntano.html> and http://rexpro.b92.net/mvm/engineerroom_eng.html.

The interviewees will take part in the discussion after the presentation, as well as colleagues from abroad who will try to compare their own experiences with the working conditions for cultural workers in Serbia and the region: Inga Zimprich (Berlin, Germany), Sonke Hallmann (Berlin, Germany) i Céline Larrère (Paris, France).

Moderator of the discussion will be Marijana Cvetković.

This residency and research belong to the Crossroads East West intercultural dialogue programme, implemented as part of Engine Room Europe, a three-year project carried out by cultural Centre REX/B92 Fund together with 11 European cultural centres. The project focuses on independent cultural workers and their field of activity and its main aim is to enhance the capacity and sustainability of independent culture in Europe. The project Engine Room Europe is carried out with the support of the European Commission.

The debate is held as part of the talks programmes at Cultural Centre REX. It is organized with the support of the Fund for an Open Society, and the programme line of intercultural dialogues is supported by the Ministry of Culture of Republic of Serbia.

tek sto



texts

RADNIČKA ANKETA; DEBATA I PREZENTACIJA U REX-U, 29. JANUAR 2013.

Debata na kojoj su učestvovali kulturni radnici iz Beograda i Novog Sada sa kojima su bili pravljene intervjui modificirane Marxove Radničke ankete kao i drugi zainteresirani. Prezentacija "rezultata" istraživanja i fanzina.

> Kratka prezentacija ankete

T.z. beogradska radnička anketa koju smo REC i Škart radili septembra 2012 je modificirana verzija ankete iz Madrida (vidi debata i prezentacija: REC i WIG, Rex, junij 2011). Za razliku od Madrida u Beogradu i Novom Sadu su se svi intervjui snimali. Anketa sadrži 85 pitanja, trajanje pojedinačnih intervjua je od pola sata do sata i pol. Pitanja se vežu na nekoliko tema: prvi dio - obrazovanje, studentski rad, volonterski rad, političke aktivnosti tokom perioda studija, drugi dio - sadašnji rad intervjuisanih, vrsta zaposlenja, tip ugovora, socialno osiguranje, treći dio: konflikti na poslu, cenzura, društvene / političke pozicije, ušesće u demonstracijama, praćenje radničkih protesta.

> Faze i metodologija rada

- Priprema ankete (pitanja).
- Izbor učesnika odnosno kulturnih radnika koje smo intervjuisali (u većini kognitivni kulturni radnici, aktivni u polju kulture i politike, koji su u većini imali konflikte na radnom mestu);
- Metoda: t.z. militant research;
- Proizvodi rada: debata 2011, intervjui 2012, debata 2013, fanzin 2013 i tekstovi/cртеži u završnoj publikaciji ERE projekta.

> Sažetki intervjua, ključne topike

Najamni rad / kulturni (umetnički) rad

Autonomija / eksploatacija

Individualna / kolektivna borba

Antagonizmi u produkciji, antagonizmi u radu

Pitanje otpora protiv eksploatacije i komodifikacije

Kontradiktorna pozicija: najamni rad versus iluzorne privilegije neke određene klase

> Zajedničke tačke anketa

Visok stupanj otuđenja od proizvoda rada

Fragmentacija radnog vremena, nestabilan život

Odsustvo socijalne i druge sigurnosti

Visok nivo cenzure ili autocenzure

Prekovremeni rad koji se nigde ne računa - samoeksploatacija

Konflikti sa političkim, institucionalnim ili desničarskim strukturama

Nepoverenje u postojeće sindikate

Potreba za uspostavljanje i organiziranje borbe protiv stanja kakvo jest

Pitanje solidarnosti

> Zapažanja

Kulturno-umetnička scena je usmerena prema razrešavanju međusobnih konflikata. Kao u svakoj manjoj sredini i tu postoji visok nivo "neproverenih tračeva." Umesto traženja zajedničkih tačaka i mogućnosti kako raditi zajedno scena je fragmentirana i više orijentisana ka nekonstruktivnom traženju razlika. Radnička anketa je možda u tom kontekstu bila neke vrste pokušaj prema mogućnostima za drugačiji način organiziranja. Kao što znamo zajednička identiteta ne postoji, samo zajednička iskustva eksploatacije. Ili drugačije: moć leži u samoorganizaciji a ne u zastupništvu. Postoji i konceptualni problem jezika i potreba za artikuliranjem pojmova na primer: prekarni rad, radnik/radnica, klasna borba, država, otuđenje od rada, eksploatacija, najamni rad itd.

> Samokritika

Problematičan je na početku bio subjektivni izbor anketiranih. Pitanja su, kako su komentirali neki intervjuisani, preširoka. Mali broj intervjua nije dovoljan za analizu stanja u kulturi. Prevelika očekivanja oko rezultata. Problematična i pozicija istraživača "od vani" koji ne poznaje dovoljno

situaciju odnosno kritika, da bi zbog toga Radnička anketa mogla postati "još jedan međunarodni sexy projekat".

> Šta dalje?

Kako se ispostavilo potrebno je još više analiza stanja radnika/ca u kulturi, da bi se na taj način istražila zajednička iskustva eksploatacije, a posledično i zajednički interesi te mogućnosti zajedničkog organiziranja. Neke ideje na debati su bile u pravcu uspostavljanja "udruga", uključivanja pravnika (velik je problem komunikacija sa birokratskim državnim aparatom, isto tako pitanje žalbi i slično), ili nezavisnih "sindikata".

Uključivanje i drugih radnika u debate. Povezivanje sa sličnim međunarodnim kolektivima ili grupama.

Bojana Piškur, REC

**WORKER'S INQUIRY:
DEBATE AND PRESENTATION, REX, 29TH OF JANUARY 2013**

The participants in the debate were cultural workers from Belgrade and Novi Sad who were interviewed in accordance with a modified version of Marx's Worker's Inquiry! Presentation of research "results" and the fanzine.

> Short presentation of the Inquiry

The so-called Belgrade Worker's Inquiry conducted by REC and Škart in September 2012 is a modified version of the Madrid Inquiry (see REC and WIG debate and presentation, June 2012). All Belgrade and Novi Sad interviews were recorded, which was not the case in Madrid. The inquiry consists of 85 questions, with individual interviews lasting from half an hour to hour and a half. The questions are tied to several subjects: part one – education, student activity, volunteer activity, political activity during studies; part two – current work of the interviewee, type of job, type of contract, social security; third part – conflicts at the workplace, censorship, social/political position, participation in demonstrations, involvement in worker protests.

> Work phases and methodology

- Inquiry preparation (questions).
- Selection of participants i.e. cultural workers to be interviewed (by and large cognitive cultural workers, active in culture and politics, mostly with experience of workplace conflicts)
- Method: so-called militant research.
- Work outcomes: debate 2011, interviews 2012, debate 2013, fanzine 2013 and analysis/drawings in the final ERE project publication.

> Interview digests, key topics

Wage labour / cultural (artistic) work

Autonomy / exploitation

Individual / collective struggle

Antagonisms in production, antagonism at work

The issue of resistance against exploitation and commodification

Contradictory position: wage labour vs. the illusory privilege of a specific class

> Common points

A high degree of alienation from products of one's work

Fragmentation of working hours, unstable living

Lack of social and other security

A high level of censorship or self-censorship

Overtime work not recorded – self-exploitation

Conflicts with political, institutional or right-wing structures

Distrust towards existing unions

The need for initiating and organizing the struggle against current conditions

The issue of solidarity

> Observations

The cultural and artistic scene is geared towards solving internal conflicts. As in any small community, there is a high level of "unverified gossip". Instead of seeking out common ground and possibilities for cooperation, the scene is fragmented and more oriented towards unconstructive seeking out of differences. The Worker's Inquiry was perhaps, in this context, a sort of an attempt towards a different way of organization. As we know, there is no common identity, only common experience of exploitation. Or, to put it another way: the power lays in self-organizing, and not in representation. There is also a conceptual problem of language and the need to articulate the terminology, for example: precarious work, worker, class struggle, state, alienation from work, wage labour etc.

> Self-criticism

The subjective selection of those surveyed was a problem at first. The

questions were, according to some interviewees' comments, too broad. A small number of interviews is not sufficient for analyzing the state the culture is in. Too high expectations from the results. Problematic position of the "external" researcher, which is not acquainted with the situation well enough, that is, criticism that the inquiry could become "just another international sexy project" because of that.

> What's next?

As it turns out, it takes more than the analysis of the state of the culture workers, in order to explore the common experiences of exploitation, and consequentially, the common interests and possibilities for cooperative organization. Some of the ideas addressed in the debate advocated for setting up "collectives", including legal personnel (there is a huge problem of communication with state bureaucracy, filing complaints and so on) or independent "unions". Including other workers in the debates. Connection with international collectives and groups.

Zoran Pantelić

OSVRT

Susret u Rex-u povodom prezentacije upitnika i istraživanja 'Radnička anketa' koju je realizovala Bojana Piškur iz Ljubljane u saradnji sa Đorđem Balmazovićem iz grupe Škart je bio jedan od povoda da se osvrnemo na stanje na sceni u savremenoj umetnosti Srbije, tačnije na situaciju u polju u kojem stvaramo... Moderatorica ovog skupa bila je Marijana Cvetković koja deluje u polju izvođačkih umetnosti, ali sa velikim iskustvom rada u polju savremene kulture, pa je ona otvorila skup kroz detekciju trenutne situacije nizanjem čitavog spektra pitanja za samopropitivanje svih prisutnih u vezi sa mogućim oblicima borbe istovremeno, kako za bolje uslove rada, tako i za status savremenog stvaralaštva u savremenom srpskom društvu...

Realizacija, pa potom analiza sprovedene ankete, je samo u nekim opštim fragmentima imala dodirne tačke sa prethodnim istraživanjem, sa istim metodološkim postupkom kroz anketu, ispitivanjem zaposlenih u Narodnom muzeju Reina Sofija u Madridu, ali je kontekst i okvir u kojem je vršena anketa bitno drugačiji, te se ni na koji način nije usmeravalo ka komparaciji ova dva iskustva.

U ovom slučaju sprovedene ankete u Srbiji, primarna intencija je bila da se kroz upitnik sa protagonistima iz sfere savremene umetničke prakse utvrde uslovi rada u kulturi - stepen i nivoi preraspodele rada, eksploatacije, prekarosti unutar novonastalog društvenog ambijenta u kojem delujemo u poslednjih desetak godina.

Suštinski 'Radnička anketa' je pre svega utvrdila opšta mesta kojih smo svi u polju svesni...

Ključna reč koja objedinjuje stanje u sektoru kulture, kao i status svih u njemu, je nesigurnost, a iza nje se nižu stepeni rizika, suočeni sa nemogućnošću realizacije bolovanja, godišnjih odmora, trudničkog odsustva, regulisanje socijalnog osiguranja i penzijskog fonda itd.

Kroz unakrsne digresije i opise stanja i ličnih iskustava učesnika/ca potvrdila se teza da su samostalni radnici i radnice u kulturi spontano uspostavili poziciju sitnih preduzetnika u borbi da obezbede egzistenciju i realizuju svoje programe... To proizilazi iz činjenice da su individualni protagonisti i NVO u kulturi devedesetih bili nosioci ideje tržišno orijentisane kulture i da se sada mnogo teže vrši refleksija i kritika stanja,

jer se mnogi od njih sada nalaze u nezavidnoj poziciji da osporavaju oblik reprodukcije kapitalističkih odnosa koje su i sami izneli u tranzitornom periodu...

Taj staro-novi tržišno orijentisani model je inkorporiran na jedinstven način (ratovi, hiperinflacija, tajkunizacija, privatizacija, kvaNGOsi, restitucija) pod uslovima burazerske ekonomije, bez osnovnih nivoa sistemske uređenosti poslovanja ili sektora već je prepušteno spontanom snalaženju u okviru zakonskih okvira. U tom segmentu razgovora je spomenut i jedan vid torture forme nad sadržajem, odnosno da smo svedoci da se, kroz razne oblike, pravna regulativa perverzno usklađuje sa zakonskim regulativama i da je taj aspekt pravne prakse nadvladao nad sadržajem, čime je znatno pogoršan status sektora kulture, scene i individualno u polju, što se konačno odražava na kvalitet života, uslova za rad i razvoj polja.

Opšte karakteristike uslova rada freelance-ra, samostalnih umetnika/ca je vrlo zabrinjavajuće, ali istovremeno se suočavamo sa ogromnim stepenom infantilnosti, neinformisanosti, samocenzure kod samih učesnika/ca u polju... Takva letargija proizilazi iz opšte društvene apatije, pa se u razgovoru potvrdila ustaljena praksa da se u okviru scene deluje samoreferentno bez pravih inicijativa u širem društvenom kontekstu, sa posebnim akcentom na slučajeve autocenzure i generalnog znanja, nedostatka snage, volje i hrabrosti.

Polemialo se o mogućim oblicima borbe i aktivnostima za promenu stanja počevši od legitimnih kanala u komunikaciji sa administracijom, preko sindikalnog reorganizovanja (jer nijedna sindikalna organizacija koja deluje u Srbiji nije prepoznata kao dobra platforma za saradnju), pa do radikalnih metoda nasilnih terorističkih akcija/prepada. U više navrata je istaknuto da je neophodno zakoračiti u polje političke borbe kako bi se izvršila toliko neophodna promena stanja.

Osvrt na propitivanje statusa radnika/ca u kulturi nije moguće razviti dalje od trenutne detekcije, jer se u ideološkom smislu suočavamo sa scenom heterogenog sastava i nedostatka kohezivnog faktora za dalje konkretne akcije, jer kontekst u kojem mi sagledavamo ulogu radnika/ca u kulturi sada egzistira na vrlo jasnoj distanci od radništva-proleterijata kao jedan oblik reprodukcije kapitalističke strukture radnika preduzetnika u prekarnoj samoeksploatisanoj poziciji.

Nastaviće se.

Zoran Pantelić

REVIEW

The meeting in Rex Cultural Centre on the occasion of the presentation of questionnaires and surveys conducted and gathered in the "Workers' Survey" project by Bojana Piškur in Ljubljana, in cooperation with Djordje Balmazović of Skart, was a fine opportunity to take a better look at the state of the contemporary art scene in Serbia, or to be more precise, the situation in the field in which we create... The moderator of the meeting was Marijana Cvetković, a performance artist with substantial experience in the field of contemporary culture. She opened the meeting with an attempt to determine the current situation by asking a broad spectrum of questions aimed at helping all participants examine themselves regarding the possible forms of struggle – be it for better working conditions or for the status of contemporary art in contemporary Serbian society... The undertaking of the survey and the following analysis were tangentially related to previous research which used the same questionnaire methodology to survey the staff of the Reina Sofia National Museum in Madrid. But the context and framework in which the survey was carried out were essentially different, and so the analysis was in no way directed towards a comparison of the two experiences.

The primary intention was to survey the protagonists in the field of contemporary art practice in Serbia, and thus to ascertain the conditions for working in culture – the extent and levels of redistribution of labor, exploitation, and precariousness within the newly-established social environment in which we have been operating for the last decade.

Essentially, the 'Workers' Survey' primarily served to reaffirm commonplace assumptions that everyone in the field is already well-aware of...

The key word that combines the state of the cultural sector and the status of everyone in it is insecurity, followed by risk level, being faced with the impossibility of getting sick leave, vacation, maternity leave, of having sound social security and pension funds, and so on.

The hypothesis that self-employed workers and workers in culture spontaneously position themselves as small entrepreneurs, in a constant fight to secure their livelihoods and develop their programs, was confirmed through techniques of cross-digression together with

participants' descriptions of their state of mind and personal experiences. This stems from the fact that individual protagonists and NGOs on the cultural scene in 1990s Serbia were at the forefront of the idea of market-oriented culture; and today it has become much more difficult to perform social reflection and criticism, because many among them are now in the unenviable position of having to question the form of reproduction of capitalist relations that they themselves carried out in the transitional period...

The old-new market-oriented model has been incorporated in a unique way (wars, hyper inflation, tycoonisation, privatization, quangos, restitution). Under a crony-capitalist economy, without even the most basic level of regulation of business practices in the sector, everything comes down to spontaneous creative coping within the loose legal framework. In this segment of the interview there was talk of torture of form over content - how we have witnessed legal practice getting perversely twisted in order to comply with the law and how this aspect prevailed over the content itself. In turn, this was a significant factor in the deterioration of the status of both the overall cultural scene and individuals in the field - which ultimately reflects on the quality of life, working conditions in the field and its further development.

The general working conditions for freelancers or independent artists are very distressing. But simultaneously, we are faced with a huge degree of infantilism, ignorance and self-censorship by the protagonists in the field... Such lethargy stems from a sort of general social apathy. In the ensuing conversation, a common practice was confirmed as such: the protagonists on the cultural scene act self-referentially without any real initiative in the broader social context, with special focus being given to cases of self-censorship and displayed lack of general knowledge, strength, will and courage.

Possible forms of struggle and activities aimed at changing the situation were discussed, ranging from legitimate channels of communication with the state administration, over union reorganization (as no trade union organization operating in Serbia was recognized as a good platform for cooperation), to radical methods of violent terrorist acts/attacks. It was pointed out on several occasions that it is necessary to step into the field of political struggle for the necessary changes to take place.

A review of the survey of the status of culture workers cannot be much more than a snapshot of the current state, seeing that, ideologically speaking, we are confronted with a heterogeneous scene that lacks any sort of cohesive factor in order to carry out further actions... Because

the context in which we perceive the role of culture workers now stands at a very clear distance from the working class - the proletariat - it has become a form of reproduction of the capitalist structure of employees-entrepreneurs in a precarious position of self-exploitation.

To be continued.

KULTURA RADNIČKIH SIMULAKRUMA

Nakon mog učešća u prošlogodišnjoj anketi, organizovanoj od strane Radical Education Collective iz Ljubljane, a zatim i na okruglom stolu (kvadratne forme), održanom ove godine u prostoru bioskopa Rex (koji to odavno nije), sa temom rada i položaja radnika i radnica u kulturi, ono što mi je na početku bilo nedovoljno jasno, a ticalo se svrhe i cilja ove „kulturno-umetničke“ akcije, tako je ostalo i posle njenog završetka. Možda je čak stepen nejasnoće postao dublji. Uprkos trudu da sve to obojim nekim udaljenim smislom, makar se on ogledao u obliku zajedničke namere za realnim ili izmišljenim boljitkom, ne mogu pobeći od utiska da smo u „Radničkoj anketi“ bili prisutni u ulozi nekog drugog od onoga što jesmo. Nalik kvadratnom stolu i bioskopu, u interakciji smaknutog značenja, dva sata smo čekali Godoa. Ili ako odbijem da budem naivan, možda je od početka uz projektovane teme, aplikacije, sredstava, nivo i rezultat same ankete, sve to trebalo baš tako da izgleda?

Ovde vremenom nešto drugo postaje jasnije, kako se mi, označeni terminom radnici u kulturi, dirigovano vrtimo u zadatom prostoru, i u međusobnoj komunikaciji sa upotrebom praznog jezika gubimo mogućnost uvida u uzroke sopstvene zaglavljenosti. Jednostavno rečeno, tu smo a ne postojimo.

Kada bih sebe sa ogromnim naporom vratio u položaj čiste naivnosti, na granicu bezobrazluka, tada bih pomislio da postoje i drugačiji metodi delanja, takvi da pogađaju uzroke ovog neželjenog stanja, i da nas, bar delom, kritički postavljaju prema problemu. Možda bih čak pomislio da upotreba iskustvenog jezika izgrađenog na etičkom i profesionalnom samoodređenju, može ukazati na put ka zajedničkom cilju. I puno toga bih još pomislio, samo se plašim da za to nema ušiju.

U analizi servirane „Radničke ankete“, bilo bi najbolje krenuti uzročnim redom. Nalik spravljanju jela, gde će pored upotrebe volje i nadarenosti, ishod u velikoj meri zavisiti od sastojaka kojima započinjemo kuvanje. Primenjeno na naš slučaj, tri su osnovna činioca neophodna za ozbiljno postavljanje dijagnoze: prvi je relevantnost nosioca projekta. Drugi je adekvatno iskustvo koje bi podrazumevalo etičko - profesionalni nivo svih anketiranih. I na kraju, priroda i poreklo novca kojim se projekt realizuje.

Da nam u ovom lovu na utvare ne bi nešto pobeglo, sad krenimo obrnutim redom. Materijalna osnova našeg projekta izvedena je od budžetskih sredstava Evropske komisije i budžetskih sredstava Ministarstva za kulturu Republike Srbije, na taj način smo stekli zvanje „nezavisni“ sa umetničkom legitimacijom za osnivanje UNA – Udruženja Nezavisnih Avatara, a uz malo truda bismo u sledećem koraku mogli uzeti predviđeni budžetski novac i za pokretanje časopisa. Ovo nas nužno upućuje u predvidiv rezultat, gde se projektovani, praktični ili utopijski diskurs cinično koristi u formi eksteritorijalne impotentne slobode. Stanje u kojem se nalazimo bliže je sadržaju romana „MI“ Jevgenija Zamjatina, nego društvu slobode i socijalne pravde. Sa bitnom razlikom što je onaj komunistički rezultat prisile, dok ovaj aktuelni počiva na pojedinačno - dobrovoljnom pristanku proizvedenom na zloupotrebi ljudskih slabosti, gde za malo „para“ može mnogo toga da se kupi. Tako uspostavljen „demokratski“ sistem se gradi i unapređuje od strane političkih partija. Odavno udaljeni od građana i radnika čijim glasovima su izabrani, političari u najvećoj meri zloupotrebljavaju svoju ulogu i zajedno sa onom „većom“ politikom iznad sebe, bivaju potkupljeni za donošenje zakona u korist multinacionalnog kapitala.

Svođeci našu društvenu realnost na razumljiv govor, kako bi stvari postale jasnije, neko je dao odličan opis te stvarnosti: „Ovo je dehumanizovani poredak, gde se dobit privatizuje, a gubitak socijalizuje“.

Tu sliku pokazuju i rezultati poslednjih istraživanja u kojima se vidi da 148 privatnih firmi registrovanih na teritoriji Londona i New York-a kontroliše oko 70% aktivnog svetskog kapitala. Oni upravljaju našim životima, u kojima smo izgubili pravo na privatnost, slobodno vreme i sve ono što stoji u načelu Francuske buržuaske revolucije. Pred nama ubrzano nestaju elementi humanosti i davno stečena prava radnika odlaze u zaborav. U novonastalim uslovima položaj radnika biva pretvoren u funkciju savremenog roba, tačnije finansijsko-digitalnog roba. To je sistem u kojem živimo, a iz mnoštva njegovih kapilarnih centara stižu projektovana budžetska sredstva za simulacije pobuna, predvođene medijskim revolucionarima poput Žižeka, ili se u mikro svetu proizvode „nezavisni“ izvođači radova. Dok istovremeno, na vrhu zakonodavne piramide, jedno po jedno nestaju davno stečena prava na normalan rad i život.

Umetnost tokom istorije nije imala presudnu važnost u društvenim promenama, ali se možda istorija preko umetnosti najbolje dokumentovala, i to na osnovu primera pojedinih hrabrih umetnika, kao simbola dolazećih promena, ali oni su po pravilu loše završavali. Jer se u mnogim društvenim sistema stvaralačka sloboda u naučnoj, umetničkoj ili nekoj drugoj formi, skupo plaćala.

Danas je sve drugačije, kao da umetnici svojom praksom zaostaju za društvenom zbiljom, uplašeni i nedovoljno hrabri, pritisnuti jakim naletom opšte bankarske pljačke, oni izbegavaju svaki kritički stav upućen nosiocima takvog sistema. Epidemija egzistencijalnog straha čini poslušnost ljudi dubljom od svake one izazvane represijom.

Vođena diskusija na kvadratnom stolu u Rexu (koji se zove okrugli), uglavnom je bila nestruktuisana i pomalo stereotipna, ali za mene u najvećoj meri iznenađujuća u odnosu na stvarnost u kojoj živimo. Skoro da je apsurdno voditi polemiku na ovu temu sa idejom da će država ili neko u pomenutom sistemu odvojiti veći deo sredstava kako bi poboljšao položaj radnika u kulturi, ali će sigurno naše neartikulisano razmišljanje finansirati kroz slične projekte, kako bi postigao stepen "demokratičnosti", svakako da treba da se osećamo odgovornim.

Želeo bih još da se osvrnem i na likovni izgled fanzina, koji me je od samog svog pojavljivanja blago iritirao. Najviše svojim "škartovsko - radničkim" dizajniranjem, kao da je upravo išetao sa sastanka sindikata na kojem teče med i mleko, onako ležeran i skoro idiličan. Pun namere da likovnim sredstvima ukaže na realnu situaciju, reklo bi se, ružičastu.

Zaključak

Ako bih uprkos gore navedenoj analizi, naterao sebe na još jedan beskorisni napor, i svoju malu opservaciju završio u postmodernističkom stilu, stihom Lepe Lukić: "Od izvora dva putića...", prvi bi podrazumevao pažljivo artikulisanje zajedničkog interesa i ozbiljnu sindikalnu borbu unutar sistema. No sve procene govore da na kraju tog puta stoje stihovi jedne druge subkulturne ikone, Mice Trofitaljke, sa jasnim opisom moći koje proizlaze iz takvog izbora: "I labavi može da zabavi!"

Drugi "putić" se zove anarhistički sudar sa sistemom, sa jasnim stavom da se ništa ne može promeniti iznutra. Primer za to su hrabri momci iz Grčke, predvođeni mladim Nikolasom Romanosom.

Izbor je samo na vama, srećno drugovi!

Pardon, zaboravio sam na treći, koji je meni najmiliji, a to je smeh! Jevgenij Zamjatin zastupa misao da se smehom može pobediti čak i smrt.

Saša Pančić

THE CULTURE OF WORKERS' SIMULACRA

After my participation in the survey organized by Radical Education Collective from Ljubljana, and later at a round table (which was actually a square) that took place in Rex Cinema (which has not been a cinema for a long time), on the subject of culture work and the condition culture workers find themselves in, the thing that was not sufficiently clear to me at first – related to the purpose and the goal of this "cultural-art" action - unfortunately remained so even after everything was finished.

Perhaps the degree of vagueness was even greater. Despite the effort to color the entire endeavor with some kind of remote purport, even if it was merely a case of joint intent to achieve some real or imaginary improvement, I cannot escape the feeling that we were present in the "Worker's Survey" in a different role than we are in reality. Akin to a square table in a cinema, in an interaction of elusive significance, we have been waiting for Godot for two hours. Or, if I refuse to be naïve, maybe it was supposed to look like that in the first place, with all the projected themes, applications, resources, the level and the result of the survey?

In time, something else becomes clear here: how all of us, signified by the term culture workers, are spinning, as if orchestrated, in a given space, communicating among ourselves by using empty language, thus losing the ability of insight into the causes behind us becoming stuck. Simply put, we are here, but we do not exist.

If I were to make that great effort of going back to a place of pure naïveté, at the very edge of insolence, I could think that there are other methods of acting, methods that hit upon the exact causes of this unwanted state, and which at least partly allow us to critically view the problem. Perhaps I would even think that the use of a language of experience, built upon ethical and professional self-determination, could show us the way towards a joint goal. And I could think of much else, but I am afraid that there are no ears to hear it.

In analyzing the "Worker's Survey" that has been served to us, it is best that we approach the analysis causally. Like preparing a dish, where besides will and talent, the result to a large degree depends upon the ingredients we use to begin with. Applied to our case, there are three basic

factors necessary to make a serious diagnosis: the first is the relevancy of the bearer of the project. The second is the adequateness of experience - which would mean the ethical-professional level of those surveyed. And finally, the nature and the origin of funds used to realize the project.

So as not to overlook anything in this wraith-hunt of ours, let us start in reverse order. The material foundations of our project were allocated from the budgets of European Commission and the Ministry of Culture of Serbia. In that way, we acquired the title of "independent" and the artistic legitimacy to establish AIA - the Association of Independent Avatars, and with a little more effort, the next step could be to take the provided budget funds and establish a magazine. This necessarily points us towards a predictable outcome, where the projected, practical and utopian discourse is cynically used in the form of an ex-territorial, impotent freedom. The state we are in is closer to the contents of the novel *Us* by Yevgeny Zamyatin, then to the society of freedom and social justice, with one important difference: the former is the result of communist coercion, and the later rests on individual-voluntary acceptance, manufactured by abusing human weaknesses, where one can buy a lot for a little amount of "cash". Such a "democratic" system is built upon and improved by political parties. Long since removed from citizens and the workers who have voted them into office, most politicians abuse their roles and are bribed, along with the "larger" politics behind them, to pass laws that benefit multinational capital.

Reducing our social reality to comprehensible speech, in order to make things clearer, someone gave an excellent description of that reality: "This is dehumanized order, where profits are privatized and losses are socialized."

This is a picture that is also painted by the results of the latest survey that shows that 148 privately held companies registered in London and New York control about 70% of global capital. They control our lives and we have lost our right to privacy, leisure and everything that makes up the principles of French bourgeois revolution. In front of us, the elements of humanity are vanishing fast and worker's rights that have been won a long time ago are now being forgotten. In these newly created conditions, the worker becomes a modern slave - actually, a financial-digital slave. That is the system in which we live, and the multitude of its capillary centers channel projected budget funds intended to simulate rebellion, led by media revolutionaries like Žižek, or to manufacture "independent" contractors content in their micro-world. While simultaneously, at the top of the legislative pyramid, the ancient rights to a normal work and a normal life are disappearing.

Over the course of history, art was not of crucial importance for social

change, but perhaps history was best documented through art, in examples of brave artists as symbols of oncoming changes - though, as a rule, they did not end well, because in many societal systems, creative freedom in science, art or other forms had a steep price.

Today everything is different, as if artists with their practice are lagging behind the social reality, scared or not courageous enough, pressed by the furious onslaught of the bankers' pillage, they eschew a critical attitude towards the pillars of such a system. The epidemic of existential fear creates obedience deeper and stronger than repression ever could.

The discussion that took place at the Rex square table (called a round table) was mostly unstructured and somewhat stereotypical, but for me it was to a large degree surprising in relation to the reality which we all live in. It is almost absurd to have a polemic related to this subject with the idea that the state or someone in the aforementioned system will allocate more resources to improve the working conditions of culture workers. But what is certain is that our unarticulated thinking will be financed through similar projects, in order to increase "democracy", for which we should certainly feel responsible.

I would also like to quickly review the "look" of the fanzine, which has been mildly irritating to me since the beginning. Mostly with its "discarded-worker" design, like it was fresh out of a union meeting where milk and honey are still flowing, the art direction is leisurely and almost idyllic. Art filled with intent to point towards the real state of things - which is, it seems, just peachy.

Conclusion

If, despite this analysis, I could force myself to another useless effort, I could finish my little observation in a post-modern manner, quoting a verse by Lepa Lukić: "From the spring well two roads lead..." The first road would mean a careful articulation of shared interest and a serious fight against the system, led by unions. But all estimates point towards a sad fact that, at the end of this road, we would be met with a verse from another subcultural icon, Mica Trofirtaljka, which clearly describes the power of this choice "Even a soft cock can make you rock!"

The second "road" is an anarchic clash with the system, with a clear attitude that nothing can be changed from the inside. Such examples are to be found in brave Greek anarchists, led by the young Nikolaos Romanos.

The choice is yours - good luck, comrades!

Excuse me, I have forgot the third road, which is dearest to me personally. Laughter. Yevgeny Zamyatin supports the notion that laughter can overcome even death itself.

Marijana Cvetković

OTUĐENJE OD SOPSTVENOG RADA – KULTURA U SRBIJI DANAS

Prekarni uslovi rada u oblasti kulture i umetnosti na našim prostorima, između ostalog, dovode do postepenog nestanka razlika u uslovima rada na takozvanoj nezavisnoj umetničkoj sceni i na institucionalnoj sceni, tj. u javnim institucijama kulture.

Na obe strane delovanja u oblasti kulture dolazi do otuđenja od sopstvenog rada odnosno otuđenja od sredstava za rad kao što je kritičko mišljenje. To za posledicu ima potpunu samopredaju i konsekventnu marginalizaciju kulture u društvu.

Sa jedne strane, freelance radnici u kulturi imaju slobodu odlučivanja o tome kojim će se temama baviti, u kom će pravcu ići njihov profesionalni razvoj i angažman, kao i o tome sa kim će raditi i sa kim će se profesionalno udruživati. Ali, oni sve češće govore o cenzuri i samocenzuri uslovljenoj dominantnim mehanizmima produkcije na nezavisnoj sceni koja finansijska sredstva za rad nalazi kod raznovrsnih izvora finansiranja i u različitim oblicima koproduciranja. Ovi mehanizmi sve češće navode na odluke o samocenzuri zarad “viših” ciljeva projekta i njegove misije.

Na sličan način, kulturni radnici u javnim institucijama, pod pritiskom politika interesnih grupa (najčešće političkih partija kojima se predaje resor kulture na milost i nemilost članova zainteresovanih za kulturu, a bez ikakvih mehanizama kontrole, provere zakonitosti rada ili vrednovanja rezultata) najčešće rade u atmosferi cenzure i samocenzure.

Samocenzura i samoograničavanje slobode govora i delovanja postaju karakteristike javnog delovanja u društvu koje svoje odnose gradi na principu ličnog, a ne opšteg interesa, te pripadnost ili bar “nezameranje” određenim grupama postaju osovina konstituisanja društvenih odnosa. Takav mehanizam omogućava (samo)cenzuru kao uvod u otuđenje od sopstvenog rada, odustajanje od stručnosti i profesionalne etike, kritičkog odnosa prema predmetu rada i društvenom kontekstu.

Drugi mehanizam koji doprinosi otuđenju od rada i u nezavisnoj i u institucionalnoj kulturi jeste oblik zapošljavanja, odnosno uslovi i načini profesionalnog angažmana.

Dok zaposleni u javnom sektoru kulture bivaju angažovani pod, naizgled, povoljnijim uslovima (ugovor na neograničeno vreme, plaćeni doprinosi, plaćen odmor...), njihov ekonomski položaj je dugoročno veoma nestabilan. Status stalno zaposlenog više nije siguran jer mnogi drugi faktori destabilizuju tu sigurnost, a najviše gore pomenuto nasilje interesnih grupa i cenzura, te "internalizacija" nasilja koja vodi odustajanju od sopstvenog rada, a dugoročno i destabilizaciji ekonomske pozicije radnika u kulturi (napuštanje posla, dugotrajna bolovanja, gubitak profesionalnih angažmana i slično).

Radnici na nezavisnoj sceni svoju prekarnost teško mogu da reše pojedinačno, ali još uvek nema na vidiku neke kolektivne platforme koja bi pitanja prekarijata radnika u kulturi stavila u širi kontekst radničkih pitanja, političke ekonomije i efikasnog političkog delovanja. Nemogućnost ostvarivanja svojih radnih prava kroz dominantne oblike ugovornih odnosa za freelance kulturne radnike i uslovi produkcije u kojima neplaćeni rad tokom neograničenog radnog vremena čini veći deo angažmana kulturnih radnika, nepostojanje sigurnih mehanizama za ostvarenje prava na socijalnu i zdravstvenu zaštitu, kao i nemogućnost ostvarenja drugih prava, vodi ka dugoročnom otuđenju od sopstvenog rada i odustajanju od sopstvenog društvenog angažmana. To se ispoljava i kroz trendove iseljavanja u inostranstvo i napuštanja profesije, koji su u nekim segmentima nezavisne scene, ali i javnih institucija, veoma izraženi (na primer, savremene izvođačke umetnosti, vizuelne umetnosti, visoko obrazovanje u oblasti umetnosti i humanističkih nauka...).

Zbog toga je ultimativno pitanje danas pitanje političkog delovanja i organizovanja kulturnih radnika sa obe scene, nezavisne i one institucionalne. Od spremnosti da se prevaziđu ovakve podele i definiše zajednička akcija kroz oblike političkog delovanja koji će biti prvenstveno usmereni na rešenje uslova rada, zavisi položaj koji će neprofitni sektor kulture imati u bliskoj budućnosti.

Pristup zasnovan na svojevrsnom "strateškom esencijalizmu" (Gayatri Spivak), odnosno pokušaj definisanja zajedničkog identiteta radnika u kulturi, bez obzira na podsistem u kome se deluje (javni sektor ili nezavisna scena) i političko aktiviranje u široj radničkoj borbi postaju jedina sredstva protiv otuđenja od sopstvenog rada u kulturi danas u Srbiji.

Marijana Cvetković

ALIENATION FROM WORK IN CULTURE IN SERBIA TODAY

Precarious work conditions in culture and art in Serbia lead to, among other things, a gradual disappearance of differences in work conditions between the so-called independent scene and the institution scene, i.e. public institutions of culture.

Alienation from work is rampant on both these sides of cultural activity, but there is also the issue of alienation from the means of work, such as the ability of critical thinking. These results in complete self-surrender - and consequently, cause culture itself to become marginalized in society.

On one hand, freelance cultural workers have the freedom to choose their own subjects and the direction of their professional development and engagement, as well as who they work with and with whom they associate professionally. But, there is increasing talk about how censorship and self-censorship is stipulated by dominant mechanisms of production on the independent scene, which is funded from various sources and through various forms of coproduction. These mechanisms are increasingly steering cultural workers towards choosing to self-censor for a "higher" cause - the project and its mission.

Cultural workers in public institutions are under similar pressure, being exerted by policies of various interest groups (most often political parties that are given reins of culture institutions, which are thus at the mercy of party members who show at least some interest in culture and operate without any control mechanisms, legal supervision or evaluation of their results) creating a persistent air of censorship and self-censorship.

Self-censorship and self-limitation of both speech and action are characteristic of public action in a society that builds its relationships on the principle of personal instead of collective interest. Thus, belonging to, or at least not intimidating certain groups becomes the axis upon which societal relationships are constituted. Such a mechanism facilitates (self)censorship as the first step towards alienation from work, as well as renunciation of expertise, professional ethics and critical attitude towards the subject of one's work and its overall societal context.

The second mechanism that contributes to alienation from work in both independent and institutional culture is the nature of employment - specifically, the conditions and ways of obtaining professional engagement.

While those in the public sector are employed under seemingly more favorable conditions (indefinite term contracts, social and health security, paid leave...) their economic position is highly unstable in the long run. The status of those indefinitely employed is no longer certain because there are many other factors that destabilize it, chief among them being the already mentioned brutality of interest groups, as well as resulting censorship and "internalization" of that brutality, which lead towards renunciation of one's work, and in the long-term, towards destabilizing the economic position of cultural workers (quitting the job, long periods of sick leave, loss of professional engagement opportunities and so on).

Workers on the independent scene can hardly overcome their precarious position individually - but there is still no collective platform in sight that would place the issue of precarity of cultural workers in the overall context of worker's issues, political economy and efficient political action. For freelance cultural workers, the unfeasibility of exercising worker rights through dominant forms of contractual obligations, the conditions of production where unpaid work and indefinite working hours account for the largest portion of cultural workers' activity, the non-existence of firm mechanisms to exercise their right to social and health security, as well as unfeasibility of exercising their other rights, lead to long-term alienation from one's work and renouncement of one's social engagement. This also manifests in the dominant trend of emigration and changing professions, which are highly conspicuous in some segments of both independent scene and public institutions (for example, contemporary performance art, visual art, higher education in art and humanities...).

That is why the ultimate question today remains the question of political action acting and organization of cultural workers on both scenes, both independent and institutional. The position of the non-profit sector in the near future depends upon its readiness to overcome such divisions and to define mutual action through forms of political action acting that will primarily be aimed towards solving the issues of working conditions.

Adhering to a certain "strategic essentialism" (as postulated by Gayatri Spivak), that is, attempting to define the common identity of cultural workers, regardless of the sub-system they are active in (the public sector or the independent scene) and political activation in the wider context of workers' struggle, have become the only available means of fighting alienation from work in culture of Serbia today.

Marko Miletić

NEKOLIKO KOMENTARA O MOGUĆNOSTIMA BORBE ZA BOLJI POLOŽAJ RADNIKA U KULTURI

Razgovor koji smo vodili u REX-u u okviru programa „U mašinskom odeljenju: uslovi rada u kulturi...“, na kome je predstavljen i fanzin „Radnička anketa“ sa odštampanim delovima intervjua koji su Bojana Piškur i Đorđe Balmazović uradili sa radnicima u kulturi iz Beograda i Novog Sada, bio je retka prilika u kojoj su radnici u kulturi pokušali javno da artikulišu predloge za borbu za poboljšanje svog radnog položaja. Gotovo svi radnici u kulturi su svesni činjenica o svom lošem radnom položaju i, nakon godina jadikovanja tokom sporadičnih javnih razgovora koji su se bavili pitanjima rada u kulturi, došli smo do momenta kada se polako artikulišu određeni predlozi za borbu u koju moramo ući kako bismo se izborili za bolje radne uslove. Nastavak teksta je iznošenje određenih teza za koje se nadam da mogu doprineti daljoj artikulaciji borbe radnika u kulturi.

„Radnička anketa“, iako rađena na malom uzorku, je pokazala da se, bez obzira da li rade u javnim institucijama, kroz udruženja (NVO), da li su freelance ili samozaposleni, radnici u kulturi nalaze prekarnom položaju. Aktuelna kriza kapitalističkog sistema je dovela do urušavanja kulturne produkcije i otvorila potrebu da se razmišlja i govori o položaju radnika u ovom sektoru. Međutim, još uvek se retko u iznošenju i promišljanju predloga odlazi dalje od pokušaja da se isprave loše sprovedene reforme što sasvim odgovara floskuli koju izgovara toliko opljačkanih i obespravljenih radnika - „Nije problem u privatizaciji nego u njenom lošem sprovođenju“. To bi značilo da smo spremni da povremeno uđemo u neku vrstu protesta ili lobiranja za, recimo, veći budžet za nezavisnu kulturnu scenu (čime bi se možda katastrofa izbegla kratkotrajno), ali nismo spremni da dovedemo u pitanje sam sistem koji dovodi do ovakvog stanja.

Prekarna pozicija, u kojoj se ne nalaze samo radnici u kulturi, je posledica neoliberalne transformacije što je podrazumevalo narušavanje stečenih radničkih prava, privatizaciju društvene i javne imovine i komercijalizaciju polja kao što su nauka, zdravstvo, komunalne usluge, obrazovanje i kultura. Šta to znači za radnike može se videti i u „Radničkoj anketi“: nesigurnost po pitanju zaposlenja i zarada, životnu nestabilnost, kratkoročne ugovore, nepostojanje zdravstvenog i penzijskog

osiguranja, nepostojanje odmora, bolovanja, kao i porodiljskog odsustva, gubitak mogućnosti za sindikalno organizovanje itd.

Pitanje je kako da se borimo za poboljšanje našeg radnog položaja i mesto kulturne produkcije, a da ne završimo u ponovnom popravljaju loše sprovedenih reformi? Za početak bilo bi dobro da počnemo da razmišljamo o našoj poziciji u okviru proizvodnog procesa, a ne o posebnom mestu naših proizvoda u celokupnom društvu.

Gotovo sve borbe koje radnici u kulturi vode zasnivaju se na isticanju važnosti onoga što stvaramo. Tako ćemo u sezonskim žaljenjima na smanjivanje budžeta za kulturnu produkciju gotovo uvek podsetiti da je kultura iz raznih razloga nešto jako bitno bez čega se ne može. Istina je da je kultura nešto jako važno, ali zar to nisu i javni gradski prevoz, komunalne usluge, obrazovanje itd. - oblasti kojima se takođe drastično režu budžeti? Toliko smo opsednuti našom posebnosću da čak i kada se žalimo mi sa ponosom ističemo koliko puno možemo da radimo za jako malo para, pa kažemo nešto poput „iako dobija najmanje para iz budžeta nezavisna scena uspeva da napravi jako puno programa“. Iznoseći takve podatke mi apelujemo javnosti da razume važnost onoga što stvaramo za celokupno društvo, ali zaista, zašto bi nekome bila važnija mogućnost odlaska na izložbu od komunalne usluge odnošenja smeća?

Isticanje važnosti i posebnosti naših proizvoda dovodi do zahteva za autonomijom kulturne sfere čime samo reprodukujemo i potvrđujemo postojeće stanje. Stvaranje granice između kulture, društva i politike jednako je zahtevima za tržištem slobodnim od intervencija države ili bilo koje instance koja nije posednik kapitala. U tom smislu insistiranje na posebnosti i autonomiji kulturne sfere nas tera na principe tržišnog organizovanja i kompeticije, na borbu za grantove, poslove, poželjne partnere za projekte itd. Ova kompeticija unutar naše autonomne kulturne sfere nas ujedno onemogućava da se povežemo i borimo zajedno sa radnicima u ostalim delatnostima. Istina je da kulturna proizvodnja ne može ni postojati bez mnoštva drugih proizvodnih delatnosti, a u mnogim segmentima ni bez participacije državnog budžeta, pa bi trebalo da počnemo da mislimo i o položaju radnika u svim drugim sektorima, kao i o našem mestu u ukupnoj društvenoj proizvodnji, za razliku od isticanja posebnosti našeg položaja i proizvoda koje stvaramo.

Autonomija kulture za koju se često zalažemo direktno radi protiv nas iz još jednog razloga. Postoje dva načina na koja kapital dolazi do profita: jedan je kada organizuje proces proizvodnje u etapama, a drugi je kada kapital prisvaja već postojeći proces proizvodnje. U prvom slučaju možete zamisliti pisca koji u marketinškoj agenciji radi kao copywriter, u

drugom, recimo, kustoski tim koji radi na produkciji izložbi angažovane umetnosti. Dok nam je u prvom primeru jasno da postoji gazda za koga pisac radi i koji ubira višak vrednosti, pitanje je kako i ko ubira vrednost angažovane izložbe iz drugog primera? I zaista, teško je zamisliti da je nekome lukrativno da se bavi proizvodnjom i prodajom angažovane umetnosti, kapital ne interesuje upotrebna vrednost (edukativni impakt, kritičko sagledavanje društva, otvaranje diskusija itd), nego razmenska vrednost proizvoda (za koliko novca i koliko ljudi je spremno to da kupi). Međutim, neoliberalni kapitalizam je kroz koncept kreativnih industrija uspeo da komercijalizuje upravo tu upotrebnu vrednost koju stvaramo u okviru autonomne sfere kulture. To bi značilo da pominjana angažovana izložba neće biti direktno kao roba razmenjena za novac, ali njena upotrebna vrednost, i bez naše volje, može postati resurs (razna istraživanja, forme organizovanja, teorijski radovi itd.) kojim se hrane mašine kreativne industrije i dalje generišući profit kroz delatnosti kao što su turizam, poslovi sa nekretninama itd.

Naravno, mi ne treba da odustajemo od rada na angažovanoj umetnosti, od društvene kritike, od edukativne funkcije umetnosti itd, ali moramo odustati od samodovoljnosti i početi da shvatamo proizvodne odnose u društvu čiji smo deo. Tako ćemo i doći u mogućnost da stvorimo sindikate, koje smo u razgovoru pominjali, i zajedno sa ostalim radnicima uzmemo aktivnu ulogu u prevazilaženju kapitalističkog načina proizvodnje. Za sve to potrebno nam je dosta učenja i političkog rada.

Marko Miletić

A FEW COMMENTS ABOUT THE POSSIBILITIES OF STRUGGLE FOR A BETTER POSITION OF CULTURAL WORKERS

The conversation that took place in Rex Cultural Centre, as a part of the "In the Engine Room: the Conditions of working in culture..." program, accompanied by the presentation of the fanzine "Workers Survey", which included segments of interviews conducted by Bojana Piškur and George Balmazović with cultural workers in Belgrade and Novi Sad, was a rare occasion in which cultural workers tried to publicly articulate proposals for ways of fighting to improve their working conditions.

Almost all cultural workers in Serbia are aware of the facts relating to their poor working conditions. After years of complaints in sporadic public discussions that dealt with issues of cultural work, the time has come to articulate specific proposals for the struggle which must be commenced in order to attain better working conditions. In this text, I will disclose certain theses that I hope can contribute to further articulation of the struggle of cultural workers.

The "Worker's Survey", although conducted on a small sample, has shown that, regardless of whether they work in public institutions, via associations (NGOs), as freelancers or self-employed artists, cultural workers are in a precarious position. The current crisis of the capitalist system has led to the collapse of cultural production and opened the need to think and talk about the position of workers in the sector. However, it is still quite rare for proposals to consider anything more than ways of correcting so called "bad reforms". This is in accordance with the platitudes spoken by many plundered and oppressed workers - "The problem is not privatization, but its poor implementation." This would mean that we are willing to occasionally get into some kind of protest or try lobbying for things like bigger budgets for the independent cultural scene (which would, in truth, only delay the disaster) but we are not willing to question the system that has led to this sort of situation.

This precarious position, not exclusive to cultural workers, is the consequence of neoliberal transformation, which implies a disruption of acquired labor rights, as well as the privatization of public assets and the commercialization of various fields such as science, health care, utility

supply, education and culture. The implications of this for workers can be seen in the "Worker's Survey": uncertainty in terms of employment and wages, an atmosphere of instability, with short-term contracts, no health insurance and pension funds, disappearance of such things as vacation, sick leave and maternity leave, loss of opportunities to organize trade unions and so on.

The question is, then, how to fight for improvement of our working position and for the place of cultural production, and not end up simply re-fixing poorly implemented reforms? For one thing, it would be advisable to start thinking about our position in the framework of the production process instead of the special place of our product in the society at large.

Almost all of the struggles undertaken by cultural workers are based on emphasizing the importance of what we create. So, seasonal complaints about budget cuts for cultural production will almost always be an opportunity to remind everyone that culture is very important, something we cannot do without. It is true that culture is something very important, but isn't that also true of public transportation, utility services, education, etc. - all those areas that have also seen drastic budget cuts? We are so obsessed with our distinctiveness that even when we complain, we are proud to point out how much we can do for very little money. We say things like "even though it gets the least money from the budget, the independent scene manages to create a lot of programs." By presenting information in this way, we urge the public to understand the importance of what we create for the whole society - but really, why would someone think it was more important to have an option of going to an exhibition than having their garbage disposed of?

Highlighting the importance and uniqueness of our products leads to demands for autonomy of the cultural sphere which only reproduce and confirm the status quo. Creating boundaries between culture, society and politics is the same as asking for a market free from interventions by the state or any instance that is not the possessor of capital. In this sense, insisting on the uniqueness and autonomy of the cultural sphere forces us to adopt the principles of market organization and competition - the struggle for grants, jobs, desirable partners for projects, etc. The competition within our own autonomous cultural sphere also prevents us to relate to and fight together with workers in other fields of production. It is true that cultural production can not exist without a host of other production activities - and in many areas even without participation of the state budget - so we should consider the position of workers in all other sectors, as well as our place in the overall social production, in contrast to highlighting the uniqueness of our position and the products we create.

The autonomy of culture that we advocate often works against us for another reason. There are two ways in which capital creates profit: one is when the production process is organized in stages, and the other is when capital appropriates the existing production process. In the first case, you can imagine a writer who works in an advertising agency as a copywriter, and in the second, a curatorial team working on the production of socially engaged art exhibitions. While in the first example, it is clear that there is an owner whom the writer works for and who reaps the surplus value, the question is who reaps the value of the socially engaged exhibition and how? Indeed, it is hard to imagine that it would be lucrative for someone to produce and sell socially engaged art - capital is not interested in the use-value (educational impact, critical analysis of society, open discussion, etc.), but rather the exchange value of the product (how many people are willing to buy it and at what price). However, neo-liberal capitalism has managed to commercialize the use-value that we create within the autonomous sphere of culture, through the concept of creative industries. This would mean that the aforementioned exhibition would not be treated as a true commodity i.e. exchanged for money, but rather that its use-value can become a resource unto itself (through surveys, forms of organization, theoretical works, etc.), without us having a say in it, feeding the machines of creative industry, generating further profits through activities such as tourism, real estate sale, etc.

Of course, we should not give up creating socially engaged art, social critique, the educational function of art, etc. But we have to give up the self-sufficient attitude and begin to understand the relations of production in the society of which we are part. That way, we will create opportunities to form unions, which have been mentioned in the conversation, and take an active role in overcoming the capitalist mode of production, together with other workers. But for all this, we need to do a lot of learning and political work.

Jelena Vesić

Sići u mašinsko odeljenje kulture politički je stejment i nužda, ali i susret sa nizom paradoksa koji proizilaze iz kompleksnog odnosa relativne autonomije umetnosti i realne heteronomije rada. Za preovlađujuće (buržoasko) shvatanje kulture, mašinsko odeljenje ni ne postoji – kulturom se bave oni koji to vole, pa ih ta apolonska naklonost sviranja lire stabilno drži na oblaku na kojem žive. Idiličnu uljuljkanost 'pesmom bez granica' kvare samo oni koji pominju novac i platu, pitaju se o organizaciji rada i hoće nešto da promene. Koliko god se savremena kultura nominalno distancirala od ovog romantičnog mita o slobodi stvaranja i sa visine gledala na devetnaestovekovnu ropotarnicu u kojoj umetnička praksa putuje po retro-svetu kantijanskog 'bezinteresnog uživanja', ta nominalnost samo prikriva istinu povratka u stari poredak: nacionalna država – reprezentativna kultura – hijerarhijska institucija – sloboda koja afirmiše status quo. Modernističke institucije kulture iz vremena bivše Jugoslavije, kadrovski su kriogenizovane u osamdesetima. Kao i sve druge institucije iz doba socijalizma, nisu se probudile iz 'ratnog sna' kao javno dobro, već kroz zakulisnu privatizaciju u krugu partokratskih moćnika kojima je preporučan tržišni model, za sada u trajavom pokušaju samorealizacije. Institucije kulture koje su pokušale da traže nekakav 'treći put' ili su infrastrukturno bile isuviše važne, reprezentativne i glomazne da bi se rešile po kumo-burazerskom principu, stavljene su pod večnu rekonstrukciju, kao inovativnu formu režimske cenzure.

Priključak na 'globalni svet umetnosti' nije doneo nikakvu promenu u ovom prostoru kulturne proizvodnje, ili kako bi se bezinteresno reklo 'stvaralaštva' – on nije bio ništa više do 'daljinskog upravljača' za otvaranje prozora u multinacionalni folklor kulturnih industrija.

U međuvremenu su profesionalno stasale i generacije rođene sedamdesetih i osamdesetih godina, kojima je očito bila bliža projektna dinamika NVO sektora naraslog na antiratnim i civilnim polisama devedesetih, od sklerotičnih institucija koje su se otisnule najrazličitijim, javno nečitljivim, putevima samopreživljavanja ili tihog odumiranja. Htelo se delovati efikasno, autorski i autonomno; htelo se delovati preduzimački u p2p saradnjama, samoorganizovanim kolektivima i udruženjima; htelo se biti mobilan i slobodan... Taj novi model proizvođača kulturnih sadržaja ušao je u neizvesno polje samorealizacije (po izboru ili prinudi) kao vesnik ostvarenja alternativnih snova

kontrakulturnih pokreta iz šezdesetih i sedamdesetih godina. Cilj je bio jasan – izbeći (pra)roditeljski konformizam stalnog zaposlenja, dosadu repetitivne svakodnevice i institucionalna ograničenja koje nameće kulturna birokratija. Tako su narasle multitudine prekarnih radnika u kulturi – short-term ugovorača, samozaposlenih nomada, članova taktičkih kolektiva i NVO-ova, nezavisnih autora i kultur aktivista. Kako je vreme odmicalo, projekti se nizali, putovanja slagala, CV-i rasli do neslučenih granica, a sloboda postajala okov teško dosežne kvote inventivnog i Novog koja se morala ispuniti da bi se preživelo... Sve više vremena se provodilo u mašinskom odeljenju. I ako mašinsko odeljenje u kulturi samo uslovno postoji, kulturni prekarijat ga je s pravom izmislio. Nije ni to sasvim bez istorijskih osnova – govor o umetničkom radu, a ne o umetničkom delu (u oba smisla: i kao rad umetnika i kao proizvod umetničkog rada) postao je centralna stvar za neoavangarde šezdesetih i sedamdesetih godina. Apolonski oblak na kome obitava 'umetnost kao izraz religiozne svesti' (G. Đorđević) pao je na zemlju. Konačno su postavljena pitanja umetničke proizvodnje u samom umetničkom radu – pitanja procesa, forme i organizacije. Ova nasleđena i reaktualizovana pitanja se već dugi niz godina razmatraju u udruženjima tzv. nezavisnih umetničkih scena na različite načine, iz različitih razloga, sa različitim benefitima i različitim politikama.

Nezavisna, a zapravo višesmerno i višestruko 'zavisna' scena, ne predstavlja nikakav pokret ili blok. U pitanju je laminacija različitih kulturnih politika koje miroruju sve postojeće političke opcije uz, ne manje bitno, značajni teg nalevo u ukupnoj tendenciji ovih kulturnih organizacija. Kognitarijat (kulturni prekarijat) nije žrtva eksproprijacije socijalne države, kako se često viktimizacijski predstavlja – on je i žrtva i saučesnik. On i bira svoju situaciju i situacija bira njega. Ili, ako ćemo logikom baza-nadgradnja, kao što je govorio Marks »nije svest čoveka ono što determiniše njegovo bitisanje, već je njegovo socijalno bitisanje ono što determiniše njegovu svest«. Tako izbor i prinuda ulaze u zavodljivu simbiozu iz koje nije lako izaći niti je lako pretpostaviti dosežno rešenje.

U mašinskom odeljenju se već duže vreme sedi po sastancima i programima Druge scene, organizacije Clubture, NKSS-a i drugih parasindikalističkih i, u nekim segmentima, esnafskih organizacija. Sada se razgovori nastavljaju i pod svojim pravim imenom u KC Rex koji je već duže vreme u dijalogu i partnerstvu sa svim ovim inicijativama.

Na prvom sastanku pod nazivom »N-ta neprijateljska ofanziva« analizirani su poželjni modeli podređivanja autoritetu i infantilizacije intelektualaca i umetnika – kao preduzetnih zabavljača van institucija ili poslušnih birokrata unutar institucija – upravo kroz primere koji to nisu.

U petočasovnoj diskusiji sa očekivanim elementima traumatske ispovesti pojedinki i pojedinaca ispostavilo se da je ono što Burdževski možemo nazvati 'drugačijom kulturom ukusa' – ovde označeno 'autorskom, stvaralačkom inovativnom i socijalno zainteresovanom logikom' – imalo ozbiljne posledice koje su vodile ka narušavanju intelektualnog, egzistencijalnog, pa čak i telesnog integriteta pojedinih radnika i radnica u kulturi. Oni koji su hteli više, bolje, drugačije i napred – označeni su kao loši umetnici, neprijatni mračnjaci, svadljive kolege, izdajnici države i morala, strani fondaški agresori itd. Dok država-institucija-nacija svaki od ovih pojedinačnih slučajeva svodi na pitanje personalnosti i ličnog mentalnog sklopa pojedinaca i pojedinki, rasprava u Mašinskom odeljenju je pokazala da u svim razmatranim događajima postoji zajednički socijalno-politički imenitelj i da bez obzira na partikularnost i izolovanost slučajeva, svi oni mogu biti zbirno kontekstualizovani u širem političkom ambijentu savremene Srbije.

<http://rexpro.b92.net/mvm/ntano.html>

Druga serija debata pod nazivom »Radnička anketa«, ticala se pokušaja prevoda i implementacije Marksove radničke ankete iz 1880. godine za potrebe savremenog kulturnog prekarijata i šire, za pokušaj postavljanja nekih univerzalnijih parametara za ispitivanje statusa savremenog radništva. Projekat je inicijalno osmislila grupa kulturnih radnica u znamenitoj, kritički orijentisanoj i pamfletski progresivnoj instituciji kulture Reina Sofia u Madridu kroz projekat Radikalne edukacije koji je vodila kustoskinja i kultur aktivistkinja Bojana Piškur. Pokazalo se da i nominalno kritička institucija kulture, teorijski i praktično zainteresovana za pitanja rada i društvenu pravdu, upošljava svoje mehanizme birokratske i ekonomske prisile kada se strukturalno ugrozi njena unutrašnja hijerarhija pitanjima samoanalize i samokritike. Radnička anketa namenjena uposlenicima i uposlenicama Reigna Sofia-e, tako je završila kao 'konceptualna propozicija', jer su njeni real-ciljevi osujećeni mrežnim širenjem različitih oblika cenzura i najčešće autocenzura. http://rexpro.b92.net/mvm/engineerroom_eng.html

Na inicijativu KC Rex-a napravljena je nova radnička anketa koju su Đorđe Balmazović (član grupe Škart) i Bojana Piškur (Radical Education) uspešno realizovali i dokumentovali u saradnji sa grupom radnica i radnika u kulturi u Beogradu i Novom Sadu. Napravljene su obimne video beleške, a kratak izbor pitanja i odgovora objavljen je u bukletu pod nazivom »Radnička anketa«. Iz sažetog izbora pitanja i odgovora vidimo da kulturni prekarijat ne živi baš buržujski i da nije reč o (samo) viktimizaciji kulturnjaka kroz prisvajanje epiteta 'radnik' od koga su jasno klasno izdvojeni, a što nalazimo kao česte primedbe/optužbe koje stara-

nova levica vezuje za kulturni sektor diskvalifikujući umetnost iz polja borbi. Svakako, pitanje prekarnog rada je široka lepeza različitih pozicija i situacija i rad u kulturi ima svoje specifičnosti, ali takođe prekarni rad postaje dominantna forma ljudske egzistencije i prožima različita polja života i rada – od prodavca dinđuva na bulevaru, do gastarbajterke, ilegalnog migrantskog radnika bez papira, žene koja obavlja kućni posao i brine o ljudskoj reprodukciji, do industrijskog radnika koji je upravo otpušten u restrukturaciji bivše socijalističke privrede, romske prodavačice sakupljenih stvari na pijacama i buvljacima, pa i umetnika, kustoskinje, kritičara, predavačice na univerzitetu, intelektualaca, studenatkinje, radnika na projektima, NGO aktivistkinje itd.

Nakon izvođenja radničke ankete na lokalnu, sledio je razgovor pod nazivom »Mašinsko odeljenje Evropa« čija je osnovna svrha bilo pitanje održivosti nezavisne kulturne scene u Evropi. Već na samom pragu naziva – pitanje (ne)zavisnosti (ne)zavisne kulture u evropskom grant sistemu delovalo je kao 'nemoguća misija' za jednu panel debatu. Međutim tu nije bio kraj apetitima i ambicijama i pokušaću da sumiram tematske okvire koji su spontano stavljeni na agendu tog dana:

- Promocija i diskusija novosprovedene Radničke ankete u koordinaciji Bojane Piškur i Đorđa Balmazovića – reakcije, komentari, kako dalje itd;
- + Nastavak polemika oko pitanja pozicioniranja i unutrašnjih političkih antagonizama mreža nezavisnih kulturnih scena u Beogradu i Srbiji;
- + Međusobno upoznavanje partikularnosti i razlika problema lokalnih nezavisnih organizacija i srodnih organizacija iz Francuske i Nemačke koje su gostovale na ovoj debati (uz konsekvativni prevod!);
- + pitanje učešća nezavisnih kulturnih organizacija u širem frontu otpora dominantnom sistemu;
- + kako i da li pregovarati sa državom oko poboljšanja uslova rada nezavisne scene;
- + počeo je da kruži i novoobjavljeni fanzin u boji – Manek – koji sa jedne strane promovise cool lifestyle nezavisne scene kao poželjan model, dok sa druge strane kritikuje kulturne politike država na Zapadnom Balkanu zbog toga što ne ulažu u promociju nezavisne kulture.

Razgovor u Mašinskom odeljenju Evropa nije bila unapred kuratirana diskusija već su se različita pitanja i često kontradiktorni pravci razmišljanja o savremenom (kulturnom) prekarijatu pojavili kao izraz 'agonističkog prostora' i heterogenog delovanja nezavisne kulture ili, ako bih mogla da predložim precizniji termin – samoorganizovanih inicijativa i kooperativa. Moderatorica razgovora Marijana Cvetković, višestruko prekaljena u sličnim diskusijama u okviru rada Druge scene, nije se dala pomesti obimom zadatka – postavila je direktno pitanje 'šta da se radi' i pozvala na konkretne predloge... Zavladao je samocinična tišina... Za potrebe nastavka razgovora učesnici i učesnice projekta Radničke ankete prozivani su jedan po jedan da daju svoj komentar na ova pitanja.

Problem ovog razgovora kao refleks šireg problema delovanja 'nezavisne scene' leži u tome što se uspešan menadžment projekta (ovog puta projekta o radu u kulturi) ne poklapa nužno sa dinamikom participativnog napretka u smeru rešavanja kolektivnih društvenih ciljeva. Vrlo je teško delovati politički kroz jednokratnost projektne logike i 'grant art'. U takvim okolnostima i sa referencom na čuvenu edinburšku izjavu R. Todosijevića »Ko profitira od umetnosti a ko pošteno zarađuje«, moglo bi se, samoironično, postaviti i pitanje – ko profitira od 'umetnosti prekarijata', a ko se pošteno samoeksploatiše? Izvesno, puno je paradoksa u ovim borbama kulturnjaka, kao i na širem frontu... i očito je reč o borbama u kojima nema spektakla, herojstva i svega onoga što smo navikli da gledamo i vidimo u istorijskim reprezentacijama slavne prošlosti.

Descending into the engine room of culture is a political statement and necessity, but also an encounter with a succession of paradoxes arising from the complex relationship between the relative autonomy of art and the real heteronomy of work. As far as the dominant (bourgeois) view of culture is concerned, the engine room of culture does not even exist – those who deal with culture are its aficionados, so their Apollonian fondness for playing the lyre keeps them stable on the cloud where they live. The idyllic cushiness of this “songs without frontiers” - type atmosphere is only marred by those who mention money and salaries, wonder about the organisation of work and want to actually change something. No matter how much contemporary culture distances itself from this romantic myth about the freedom of creation and looks down from its tower on high at the scrap-heap of the 19th-century, wherein artistic practice travels through the retro-world of Kantian “disinterested pleasure”, this nominality only serves to hide the truth of the return to the old order of things: the national state – representative culture – hierarchical institution – freedom that affirms the status quo. The modernist institutions of culture from the era of the former Yugoslavia were cryogenised in terms of personnel during the course of the 1980’s. Just like all the other institutions from the era of socialism, they did not wake up from “the wartime sleep” as public property, but through a process of behind-the-scenes privatisation carried out within the tight circle of powerful partyocratic leaders who had been recommended the market-based model, which, for the time being, is making a shoddy attempt at self-realisation. Those institutions of culture that tried to find a “third road” were too important, representative or bulky in infrastructural terms to be dealt with following the principle of cronyism, so they were placed under a regime of perpetual reconstruction as an innovative form of regime-supervised censorship.

Plugging into “the global world of art” did not bring any changes in this area of cultural production, or to put it in a disinterested type of discourse, “creation” – it was nothing more than a “remote control unit” for opening a window looking onto the multinational folklore of cultural industries.

In the meantime, the generations born in the 1970’s and 1980’s have come of age in professional terms, generations to whom the project dynamics of the NGO sector, grown out of the anti-war and civil policies of the 1990’s, were closer than the sclerotic institutions that had set out on very

diverse, publicly illegible courses of survival or slow extinction on the quiet. One wanted to act efficiently, authorially and autonomously; one wanted to act entrepreneurially within the framework of p2p cooperation arrangement, self-organised collectives and associations; one wanted to be mobile and free... This new model of producers of cultural contents entered the uncertain sphere of self-realisation (be it of its own choice or under duress) as a harbinger of the realisation of the alternative dreams of the countercultural movements of the 1960’s and the 1970’s. The goal was clear enough – avoiding the (fore)fathers’ conformism of a permanent job, the boredom of a repetitive everyday reality and the institutional limitations imposed by the cultural bureaucracy. This led to a multitude of workers doing precarious work in culture – short-term contractual workers, self-employed nomads, members of tactical collectives and NGO’s, independent authors and cultural activists. As time passed, projects kept coming one after another, as did trips, CV’s got enlarged quite unprecedentedly, whereas freedom turned into the ball and chain of a hardly attainable quota of the inventive and New that had to be fulfilled in order to survive... One tended to spend more and more time in the engine room. And even though the engine room exists in the sphere of culture only provisionally, the cultural precariat thought it up with good reason. It was not entirely unfounded in historical terms – the discourse about artistic work rather than a work of art (in both senses: as the work of an artist and as a product of such work) became of central importance to the neo-avant-gardes of the 1960’s and 1970’s. The Apollonian cloud whereon “art as an expression of religious consciousness” (G. Đorđević) dwelt fell down to the ground. Finally, questions about artistic production within the framework of artistic work itself were being asked – the issues of process, form and organisation were being raised. These inherited and reactualised issues have been reviewed for a number of years within the associations of the so-called independent art scenes in various ways, for various reasons, with various benefits and various policies.

The independent scene, which is actually multidirectionally and multiply “dependent”, does not represent any kind of movement or a bloc. What is at work there is a lamination of various cultural policies mirroring all the existing political options; equally significantly, the bias within the framework of the overall tendencies of these cultural organisations is considerably to the left of the political spectrum. The cognitariat (cultural precariat) is not a victim of the expropriation of the social welfare state, as it is often presented in a victimising fashion – it is both a victim and an accomplice. It both chooses its situation and is chosen in turn by its situation. Or, following the logic of the basis and the superstructure, as Marx said, “it is not man’s consciousness that determines his being, but it is his social being that determines his consciousness”. Thus a possibility of

choice and duress form a seductive symbiosis that it is not easy to get out of, nor is it easy to posit an attainable solution.

In the engine room, for quite a while meetings have been held according to the programmes of *Druga scena* [The Other Scene], the Clubture Organisation, NKSS [the Independent Cultural Scene of Serbia] and other para-syndicalist and, in some segments, guild-type organisations. Now these talks are continued under their real name at the Rex Cultural Centre, which has for a long time been conducting a dialogue and maintaining partnerships with all these initiatives.

During the course of the first meeting, entitled "The Umpteenth Enemy Offensive", what was analysed were the desirable models of submission to authority and infantilisation of intellectuals and artists – as entrepreneurial entertainers outside institutions or obedient bureaucracies inside institutions – precisely through examples that were none of the above. During a five-hour debate containing the expected elements of traumatic confessions of individual participants, it turned out that what we may refer to, in the manner of Bourdieu, as a "different culture of taste" – here designated as "authorial, creative, innovative and socially interested logic" – had serious consequences leading to a violation of the intellectual, existential, even bodily integrity of some cultural workers. Those who wanted to do more, better, differently and to move forward – were marked as bad artists, unpleasant curmudgeons, cantankerous colleagues, traitors to the state and morality, aggressors financed from foreign funds, etc. While the state-institution-nation reduces each of those individual cases to the question of personality and the mental set-up of the individual in question, the debate conducted in the engine room showed that there was a common socio-political denominator to all the phenomena examined, and that regardless of the particularity and isolated character of each individual case, all of them can be contextualised together within the broader political climate of contemporary Serbia.

<http://rexpro.b92.net/mvm/ntano.html>

Another series of debates, entitled "A Workers' Opinion Poll", pertained to an attempt at translating and implementing Marx's workers' opinion poll dating from 1880, for the sake of the contemporary cultural precariat and in broader social terms, for the purpose of establishing some more universal parameters for investigating the status of contemporary workers. The project was initially thought through by a group of female cultural workers operating within the framework of the well-known, critically oriented and pamphlet-progressive cultural institution *Reina Sofia* in Madrid, through the Radical Education project led by the curatoress

and cultural activist *Bojana Piškur*. As it turned out, even a nominally critical institution of culture, theoretically and practically interested in issues related to labour and social justice, engages its mechanisms of bureaucratic and economic duress when its internal structural hierarchy is threatened through matters pertaining to self-analysis and self-criticism. The workers' opinion poll aimed at the employees of *Reina Sofia* thus ended up as a "conceptual proposition", for its real aims were obstructed by the network-like spreading of various forms of censorship, most often autocensorship.

http://rexpro.b92.net/mvm/engineerroom_eng.html

Based on the initiative of the Rex Cultural Centre, a new workers' opinion poll was conducted, successfully realised and documented by *Đorđe Balmazović* (a member of the *Škart* [Rejects] group) and *Bojana Piškur* (Radical Education), in cooperation with a group of cultural workers in Belgrade and Novi Sad. Extensive video footage of this was recorded, and a brief selection of questions and answers was published in a booklet entitled "Workers' Opinion Poll". From the condensed selection of questions and answers, we can see that members of the cultural precariat do not exactly live a bourgeois lifestyle, and that it is not a case of (self-) victimisation of cultural workers through the appropriation of the epithet "worker", compared to whom they are clearly a distinct category in class terms, which we frequently encounter as objections/accusations made at the expense of the cultural sector by the old/new left, thus disqualifying art from the arena of struggle. Certainly, the issue of precarious work constitutes a broad spectrum of different positions and situations, and work in the sphere of culture does have its specific characteristics, but precarious work is also becoming the dominant form of human existence and permeates various spheres of life and work – ranging from street vendors of cheap jewellery to *gastarbeiters*, illegal migrant workers without any documents, a woman doing the housework and taking care of human reproduction, an industrial worker who has just been laid off in the process of restructuring the former socialist economy, Roma vendors of used things in market places and flea markets, and even artists, curators, critics, university lecturers, intellectuals, students, workers engaged on various projects, NGO activists, etc.

After conducting the workers' opinion poll locally, there followed a panel debate entitled "The Engine Room Europe", the basic aim of which was to discuss the issue of the sustainability of the independent cultural scene in Europe. The very basis of the title – the issue of (in)dependence of the (in)dependent culture within the European grant system seemed like "mission impossible" for a panel discussion. However, that did not mark the extent

of our appetites and ambitions, and I shall try to summarise the thematic framework that was spontaneously included in the agenda that day:

- promotion and discussion of the newly conducted Workers' Opinion Poll, coordinated by Bojana Piškur and Đorđe Balmazović – reactions, comments, what next, etc. ;
- + continuation of the polemics around the issue of positioning and internal political antagonisms among the networks of independent cultural scenes in Belgrade and in Serbia;
- + getting mutually acquainted with the particularities and different problems of local independent organisations and affiliated organisations from France and Germany that participated in this debate (through consecutive translation!);
- + the issue of the participation of independent cultural organisations within a broader front of resistance to the dominant system;
- + how to negotiate with the state concerning the improvement of the working conditions of the independent scene (or whether to negotiate at all);
- + a newly published colour fanzine – Manek – started circulating: on the one hand, it promotes the cool lifestyle of the independent scene as a desirable model, and on the other, criticises the cultural policies of Western Balkan states on account of the fact that they do not invest in the promotion of independent culture.

The debate within the Engine Room Europe was not a discussion curated in advance; the different issues and often contradictory trends in pondering the contemporary (cultural) precariat arose as an expression of the “agonistic space” and heterogeneous operation of independent culture or, if I may suggest a more precise term – self-organised initiatives and cooperatives. The moderator of the debate, Marijana Cvetković, with a lot of experience when it comes to similar discussions within the framework of the operation of Druga scena [The Other Scene], did not baulk at the scope of the task: she asked a direct question – “What next?” – and asked for specific proposals... A self-cynical silence ensued... For the purpose of continuing the debate, the participants of the Workers' Opinion Poll project were invited, one after another, to comment on those issues.

The problem with this debate, as a reflection of the broader problem of the operation of “the independent scene”, lies in the fact that successful

management of a project (this time a project concerning work in the sphere of culture) does not necessarily coincide with the dynamics of participatory progress in the direction of resolving collective social goals. It is very difficult to act politically through the logic of one-off projects and “grant art”. Under such circumstances, and referring to the well-known Edinburgh Statement by R. Todosijević – “Who profits from art and who makes honest earnings from it?” – one could pose a self-ironic question as well: “Who profits from ‘the art of the precariat’, and who honestly self-exploits him/herself?”... Certainly, there are a lot of paradoxes in these struggles among cultural workers, and on a broader front as well... and those are evidently struggles wherein there is no spectacle, heroics and all that we have become accustomed to watching and seeing in historical representations of the glorious past.

HOW WE (CULTURAL WORKERS), DEBATE

Upon invitation to participate in this debate, I thought that instead of writing a reaction, I should start by discussing my relation to some of the recent debates I have participated in or listened to in Berlin. Why, I ask myself, is it so very difficult for me to liberate myself from the role of the ever more annoyed or resigned audience and continuously voice my stance instead, however weak or grim?

In Berlin a number of initiatives that deal with the working conditions of cultural workers (here we still call them "cultural producers") have emerged in the last two to three years, ranging from the Network of Independent Project Spaces and Initiatives (Netzwerk freier Projekträume und Initiativen*) to the Initiative Stadt Neudenken** (Rethinking the City) to Haben und Brauchen*** (To Have and To Need) and Koalition der Freien Szene**** (Independent Scene Coalition) to the actual tenants' protests Kotti & Co***** (protests of the tenants of the housing projects at Kottbusser Tor). Their forms of organisation differ, there are loose contexts, held together by a few exhausted individuals, legal associations, lobby groups and semi-bureaucratic networks, as well as actual activist work like preventing evictions. The demands range from insisting on tenants' rights to obligatory artist fees, from structural funds for production spaces to applying for matching funds when large sums of money need to be raised. The need to analyse and articulate the changes the city undergoes, and the role art and artists play in them, is continuously tangible amongst artists, architects and activists. The opportunity to do so is repeatedly given in the course of a series of debates, workshops, panel discussions and summits. But what do these formats actually suggest and is there something at their foundation, that makes it hard to relate to them?

The discussions taking place in Berlin often remind me that we are so engrossed in the regimes of our CVs as a continuous investment in our future that we have difficulty telling the difference between political necessity and career opportunity: still our political engagement raises the value and credibility of our artistic work; we love holding panel discussions, instead of organizing assemblies, and we more readily listen to more eloquent speakers, than speak ourselves. We meet within the representational formats borrowed from or left over from art production,

open letters are signed by the big names first, and we willingly send representatives, even if no external party is around that one would have to negotiate with. We should, if we want to make these situations more binding, at least reflect on the arrangements we make in order to gather together, and we should question the implications of the kinds of setting we employ.

We are not patient enough to develop reliable situations. Berlin context, I note the reluctance to discuss differences. It happens in debates here*****, that activist approaches and argumentation relying on cultural city-branding are smoothly held together by a bracket as encompassing as "independent scene". Compromise is favored over conflict, also because people fear to be skipped in case money ever arrives in the network. Additionally, during the third meeting, at the latest, of whatever initiative, a faction will demand to finally abolish this endless idle talk in favor of a "creative" action that will convince "the public" at once of the righteousness of our position and the vital importance of our activities (which naturally deserve money, support and acknowledgement). By omitting differences, eventually our understanding of our own demands, remains so provisional, so unfinished that our acts boil down to lobbying and networking among interest groups, where once we thought we were already providing political articulation.

I believe we should also liberate ourselves from the idea that another more qualified theorist, specialist or panelist might be ready to analyse the conditions we're in fiercely enough to undo them by a mere act of speech. To continuously believe that we, as subjects, lack qualifications, knowledge and critical training, may be a helpful incentive to improve our knowledge, but it shouldn't hinder us from starting to articulate our stance in a given situation. Instead of rushing to attend the latest conference and academic panel discussion, eager to catch up with the latest discourse we should learn to speak ourselves, as participants in and creators of a situation which requires developing a practice of shared understanding (learning and teaching) together.

The high degree of dysfunctionality I encounter in the discussions in the art scene in Berlin, I believe, still differs from the dysfunctionality, which was probably articulated quite aptly in the discussion on the working conditions of cultural workers in Serbia. In the debate itself, the outcome of the inquiry was not presented. Instead a publication containing all interviews was distributed at the end. Rather than reflecting on the results of the inquiry itself, those interviewed were invited to discuss what could possibly be done jointly in the given situation. The moderator tried to address our fears and competitive relations and invited us to think which

other social groups we could collaborate with. Encouraging proposals like forming unions and setting up cooperatives were put forward. I consider it important that we rid ourselves from these ruling criteria of selection in contemporary art, which only acknowledge the excellent few, while dismissing the vast majority of artists who waste their time struggling for recognition.

During the debate, one participant proposed taking up arms, since she thought these discussions were leading nowhere. But considering that this had been probably the fortieth debate of this kind, she nonetheless participated in, I think this statement captured the situation best: we're gathering in a situation where no single artistic intervention, no open letter, no performative act or "art strike" could free it from its agonizing dysfunctionality. This is a situation where we know no short-term optimism can improve the working and living conditions not only of ourselves, but also of other precarious workers, refugees, the poor.

In view of the strengthening of nationalism in Europe, the tremors in today's capitalism and the pervasive renationalisation of culture, it is depressing that it remains a personal choice to politicize this situation. It will continue to require our active individual effort to make this situation a political one for each of us, in which our acts and articulations have effects. It will continue to be a personal decision to opt for forms of work based on solidarity and to form contexts that can sustain us when we try to do so. But to attend these debates and acknowledge their--at least immediate--futility will maybe allow us to gain a common understanding of the required duration and the degree of persistence we will need to keep up for a long time.

* <http://www.projektraeume-berlin.net/001/>

** <http://stadt-neudenken.tumblr.com/>

*** <http://www.habenundbrauchen.de/en/>

**** <http://www.berlinvisit.org/>

***** <http://kottiundco.net/>

***** <https://soundcloud.com/rebootfm/wasfuereinestadt>

Inga Cimprih

KAKO (MI, KULTURNI RADNICI) DEBATUJEMO

Kada sam dobila poziv da učestvujem u ovoj debati, pomislila sam da bi, umesto da pišem reakciju, trebalo da počnem tako što ću izneti svoj odnos prema nekim od skorašnjih debata na kojima sam učestvovala ili koje sam slušala u Berlinu. Pitam se zašto mi je toliko teško da se oslobodim uloge publike koja sve više iznervirana i rezignirana i da umesto toga stalno izražavam svoje stanovište, ma koliko nejasno ili sumorno ono bilo?

U Berlinu se u poslednje dve tri godine pojavilo više inicijativa koje se bave uslovima u kojima rade kulturni radnici (ovde se još uvek zovu „kulturni proizvođači“), od „Mreže prostora i inicijativa za nezavisne projekte“ (Netzwerk freier Projekträume und Initiativen*), inicijative „Novo promišljanje grada“ (Stadt Neudenken**), „Imati i trebati“ (Haben und Brauchen***) i koalicije „Slobodna scena“ (Koalition der Freien Szene****), do istinskih protesta stanara „Kotti & Co“***** (protesti stanara naselja u kvartu Kottbusser Tor). Oblici organizacije su različiti, postoje labavi konteksti koje na okupu drži nekolicina iscrpljenih pojedinaca, legalna udruženja, lobi grupe i polubirokratske mreže, kao i pravi aktivistički poduhvati, kao što je sprečavanje prinudnih iseljenja iz stanova. Zahtevi su razni, od insistiranja na poštovanju prava stanara, do obaveznih honorara za umetnike, od strukturnih fondova za produkcijske prostore, do obezbeđivanja polovine potrebnog novca od donatora, kada su potrebna velika finansijska sredstva. Među umetnicima, arhitektama i aktivistima postoji stalno opipljiva potreba da analiziraju i artikulišu promene kojima grad biva podvrgnut, kao i uloga koju u njima imaju umetnost i umetnici. Prilika za to se neprestano pruža u okviru niza debata, radionica, panel diskusija i samita. Ali na šta zapravo ukazuju ti formati razgovora i da li u njihovoj osnovi postoji nešto što otežava poistovećivanje sa njima?

Diskusije koje se održavaju u Berlinu me često podsećaju da smo toliko zaokupljeni režimom sopstvenih biografija, pošto se to smatra stalnim ulaganjem u budućnost, da teško pravimo razliku između političke nužnosti i prilika za napredovanje u karijeri. Ipak, naš politički angažman povećava vrednost i kredibilitet našeg umetničkog rada; volimo da organizujemo panel diskusije, umesto da organizujemo skupštine, osim toga, spremniji smo da slušamo elokventnije govornike, nego da sami govorimo. Sastajemo se i pritom koristimo reprezentacione formate koji su deo umetničkih

produkcija, bilo da su od njih pozajmljeni ili da su ostali posle završetka događaja. Potpisuju se otvorena pisma, prvo to čine velika imena i svojevremeno šalju predstavnike, čak i ako nema druge strane sa kojom bismo morali da pregovaramo. Ako želimo da učinimo da te situacije postanu u većoj meri obavezujuće, najmanje što treba da učinimo je da razmislimo o aranžmanima koje pravimo da bismo se okupili, a treba i da preispitamo implikacije okruženja u kome se nalazimo.

Nismo dovoljno strpljivi da stvorimo pouzdane situacije. U berlinskom kontekstu, primećujem oklevanje da se razgovara o razlikama. Događa se u debatama ovde***** da su aktivistički pristupi i argumentacija, koja se oslanjaju na brendiranje grada kao grada kulture, glatko podvedeni pod tako širok pojam kakav je „nezavisna scena“. Daje se prednost kompromisu, u odnosu na konflikt i zbog toga što se ljudi plaše da će biti preskočeni ako se desi da ikada mreža dobije nekakav novac. Osim toga, najkasnije na trećem sastanku bilo koje inicijative, jedna frakcija će zahtevati da se konačno prestane sa beskrajnim pričama i da se pokrene „kreativna“ akcija koja će odmah ubediti „javnost“ u ispravnost naših stavova i ključnu važnost naših aktivnosti (koje prirodno zaslužuju novac, podršku i priznanje). Eliminisanjem razlika, naše shvatanje naših sopstvenih zahteva na kraju postaje tako provizorno i tako nedovršeno da se naši postupci svode na lobiranje i umrežavanje interesnih grupa, tamo gde smo mislili da smo već postigli političku artikulaciju.

Takođe, smatram da je potrebno da se oslobodimo ideje da drugi kvalifikovaniji teoretičari, stručnjaci ili učesnici panel diskusija mogu biti spremni da analiziraju uslove u kojima se nalazimo i da to čine na tako žestok način da eliminišu te uslove samim činom držanja govora. Stalno verovanje da nama, kao subjektima, nedostaju kvalifikacije, znanje i kritičko mišljenje može biti koristan podsticaj da proširimo svoja znanja, ali ne treba da nas sputava da počnemo da artikulišemo svoje stanovište u datoj situaciji. Umesto da jurimo da prisustvujemo novim konferencijama i akademskim panel diskusijama, vođeni velikom željom da uhvatimo korak sa najnovijim diskursom, treba mi sami da naučimo da govorimo, kao učesnici i kreatori situacije u kojoj je potrebno da združenim snagama razvijemo praksu zajedničkog razumevanja (učenja i podučavanja).

Verujem da se visok stepen disfunkcionalnosti koji primećujem u diskusijama na umetničkoj sceni u Berlinu i dalje razlikuje od disfunkcionalnosti koja je verovatno sasvim primereno artikulisana tokom rasprave o uslovima rada kulturnih radnika u Srbiji. Ishod ankete nije bio prezentovan na samoj debati. Umesto toga je na kraju podeljena publikacija u kojoj su objavljeni svi intervjui. Umesto da se razmišlja o rezultatima same ankete, intervjuisani pojedinci su bili pozvani da

diskutuju šta može zajednički da se učini u datoj situaciji. Moderator je pokušao da ukaže na naše strahove i odnose između aktera koji su jedni drugima konkurenti i pozvao nas je da razmislimo sa kojim drugim društvenim grupama bismo mogli da uspostavimo saradnju. Izneti su ohrabrujući predlozi poput osnivanja sindikata i formiranja zadruga. Smatram da je važno da se ratosiljamo vladajućih kriterijuma selekcije u savremenoj umetnosti, na osnovu kojih nekolicina izuzetnih pojedinaca dobija priznanje, a velika većina umetnika biva odbačena, dok traće vreme boreći se za priznanje.

Tokom debate, jedna učesnica je predložila da se latimo oružja, pošto smatra da ovakve diskusije ne vode nikuda. Ali, imajući u vidu da je to verovatno bila četrdeseta debata ovog tipa u kojoj je uprkos tome učestvovala, mislim da ta izjava najbolje odslikava situaciju. Okupljamo se u situaciji koja je takva da nikakva pojedinačna umetnička akcija, nikakvo otvoreno pismo, performativni čin ili „umetnički štrajk“ ne mogu da eliminišu njenu mučnu disfunkcionalnost. Znamo da u takvoj situaciji, kratkoročni optimizam ne dovodi do poboljšanja uslova života, ne samo nas samih, nego ni drugih radnika neizvesnog radnog statusa, izbeglica i siromašnih.

S obzirom na jačanje nacionalizma u Evropi, potrese kroz koje prolazi kapitalizam danas i sveprisutni trend ponovne nacionalizacije kulture, deprimirajuće je to što politizacija situacije ostaje pitanje ličnog izbora. I dalje će biti potrebno da pojedinci aktivno ulažu napore da učine situaciju političkom za svakoga od nas, takvom da naši postupci i artikulacije imaju efekta. I dalje će opredeljenje za solidarne oblike rada i uspostavljanje konteksta, u kome pokušaj da se to ostvari može da bude održiv, biti stvar lične odluke. Ali posećivanje debata i priznavanje njihove, makar trenutne, uzaludnosti nam, možda, može omogućiti da zajedno shvatimo koliko upornosti će biti potrebno da bismo istrajali na duge staze.

Prevod: Jelena Bajić

* <http://www.projektraeume-berlin.net/001/>

** <http://stadt-neudenken.tumblr.com/>

*** <http://www.habenundbrauchen.de/en/>

**** <http://www.berlinvisit.org/>

***** <http://kottiundco.net/>

***** <https://soundcloud.com/rebootfm/wasfuereinstadt>

THE FORMATS WE CHOOSE

Rather by coincidence I recalled the kind of use newspapers like *Le Monde diplomatique* or *Lettre internationale* make of the Letter from ..., the cosmopolitan intention of which have always seemed a bit weird to me.

The Letter from ... has the intensity of a snapshot. It articulates the hardly distinguishable transition from one order to another, an episode, during which the economic crisis, the political caesura, the aftermath of a catastrophe pervade the everyday and are about to take hold of all areas of life. Overnight the city has another smell, colors (suddenly) fade or intensify, the crowd on the streets gives up on its rhythm with the deserted hours. Noise and silence remain unmediated, their onset deranged.

This is where the Letter from ... is situated, it draws its politics of language from those ornaments of sensual experience, it translates indeterminacy of a situation into the order of words. When I think of the uncountable letters published in many newspapers year by year, this specific use seems all but obvious. The Letter from ... belongs to the repertoire of journalistic writing, a rhetorical means to ponder the state of law, political participation, fault lines of the society, that one affiliates with in writing. Are our lives content? Righteous? It is those questions that the Letter from ... seems to be directed at, and precisely at the moment when, whether it is fake or not, the everyday life seems out of joint. At the same time the Letter from ... appeals in its address to our bond as readers. An appeal that is made, as it were, from town to town, from writers to readers, representing a form of solidarity.

One year has passed since the debate on conditions of work for cultural production in Serbia. To relate to it now, with such a delay, makes the administrative character often inherent in our writing, apparent. The academization of critique and economization of academia progressed further than we are probably able to admit. And what would such admission require from us as a consequence? Critique has become another dimension of self-management in our societies of control, another aspect of labor on the self -- a productivity that is entirely embedded within the structures of economic exploitation. The economies of guilt produce the subjectivity we embody even when we utter criticism.*

The pressure of economization is apparently reproduced not only in conditions of cultural labor, but also in the formats of their critique and the use we make of them. These formats have their history too, they are not exempt from the logic of competition. Bearing this in mind, we should admit that in Berlin, in the current debates on cultural labor, we do not take the questions asking who speaks, who becomes visible and how do we speak to one another, seriously enough. We tend to respond to them with the same criteria we apply when we select artists to take part in exhibitions and theorists to participate in panels. Given that there is the prevailing use of language which is embedded in these criteria, it seems that we lack other experiences in order to produce situations of collective speech. To a certain degree the figure of the expert has penetrated all formats of production of knowledge, disclosing of experience etc. Perhaps one should be reminded that the figure of the expert does not stem from science, but from factories, originating from the paradigm of self-optimization.

What I am interested in is: How can we cope with those dysfunctional situations of speech in which we find ourselves today? I mean the frustration, the exhaustion, the feeling of redundancy, the incapacity to respond to that which affects us. Also because these experiences return in writing – together with the incapacity to react to the instrumentalization of critical acts and canonization of writing and speaking. To make use of the questionnaire, which was the starting point of the debate last January, reminds me that the formats we use determine the kind of experience that can either be expressed in them through language – or remain unarticulated. It is through them that our experiences are addressed. This also concerns time. Is it not that the social relations reproduce themselves in the forms of our knowledge also by means of their temporal structure? What kind of temporality determines the formats of our critique? For instance, time that the writing requires? I don't mean time in general, whether there is enough of it. But a particular experience of time – within or beyond institutions, at home, amidst our friends, in collectives or in public spaces.

Why should we return to the Letter from ... at this point when we face the question how to respond to the social situation that is common to us but that we experience differently? Not to initiate a series of letters, of course. One of the reasons is certainly that the debate in REX has pointed out that we have to insist much more decisively on questioning and thematizing the formats of articulating our experiences and the use we make of them. The Letter from ... reminds me how these formats produce their politics. The Letter from ... draws its cosmopolitan tone, its language threshold, from bringing two experiences of time in touch with one another. The

time of an indeterminate situation from which it seems to come from, and the time in which it partakes with its readers in its appeal for solidarity.

Maybe it is sufficient to end with a few practical questions: What kind of temporality does our critique require and embody? What kind of politics do the formats we make use of reproduce? What are their addressees? What acts of appropriation and misappropriation are at work within our formats of critique? And if the constant actualization of our knowledge concerning our working conditions is not sufficient, what other experiences – including those that are missing – do we need to address? How should we internationalize our debates in the future? How to practice solidarity nowadays?

* Maurizio Lazzarato, *The Making of Indebted Man*.

Zonke Halman

FORMATI KOJE BIRAMO

Sasvim slučajno sam se prisetio upotrebe pisma u novinama kao što su *Le Monde diplomatique* ili *Lettre international* čija kosmopolitska namera mi se uvek činila pomalo čudnom.

Pismo iz... ima intenzitet instant fotografije. U njemu se artikuliše teško odrediv prelazak s jednog poretka na drugi, epizoda, u kojoj ekonomska kriza, politička cezura, posledice jedne katastrofe prožimaju svakodnevicu i poznato je da će uskoro obuhvatiti sve oblasti života. Iz dana u dan grad ima drugačiji miris, boje izgledaju blještavije ili bleđe, gužva na ulicama u časovima bez ljudi odustaje od ritma. Buka i tišina ostaju neposredovani, njihovo nastupanje poremećeno. Nenamerno jedni drugima prilazimo previše blizu, otuđeni od izraza na našim licima – možda nada, možda strah i tako dalje.

Tu je situirano pismo iz..., iz takvih ornamenata čulnog iskustva očitava se njegova politika jezika, neodređenost situacije se prevodi u poredak reči. Kada mislim na bezbrojna pisma koja se objavljuju u mnogim novinama iz godine u godinu, ova upotreba uopšte nije očigledna. Pismo iz... pripada repertoaru novinarskog pisanja, retoričko sredstvo koje omogućava da se na opšti način razmišlja o stanju stvari u pogledu prava, političkog učestvovanja, socijalnim linijama podele u društvu sa kojima se čovek poistovećuje pri pisanju. Naš život, da li je on srećan? I pravedan? Čini se da je takvim pitanjima posvećeno pismo iz... i to u trenutku, bilo da je to fingirano ili nije, u kom svakodnevica ispada iz svog uobičajenog ritma. Istovremeno pismo iz... u svom obraćanju apeluje na povezanost nas kao čitalaštva. Apel, koji takoreći ide od grada do grada, od onoga ko piše do onoga ko čita, to pismo iz.. predstavlja jedan vid solidarnosti.

U međuvremenu je prošlo tačno godinu dana od debate o uslovima rada u produkciji kulture vođene u Beogradu. Kada se sada, sa ovakvim zakašnjenjem, ponovo o tome razmišlja, ono što jasno izbija na videlo je administrativni karakter koji često prijanja uz naše akte pisanja. Akademizacija kritike i ekonomizacija akademskog napreduje više nego što smo možda u stanju da priznamo. A šta bi to priznanje od nas zahtevalo? Kritika, tvrdi se, je u društvu kontrole postala još jedna dimenzija samomenadžmenta, rada na sebi – jedne produktivnosti koja je potpuno upletena u strukture ekonomske eksploatacije. Ekonomije krivice*

proizvode subjektivnost koju otelovljujemo čak i u iznošenju kritike.

Pritisak ekonomizacije se očigledno reprodukuje ne samo u uslovima rada u kulturi, već isto tako i u formatima njihove kritike i u načinima na koje je koristimo. I ovi formati imaju svoju istoriju i nisu izuzeti iz logike nadmetanja. Kada je reč o aktuelnim debatama koje se bave uslovima rada u kulturi, pitanja koja se tiču toga ko dolazi do reči i ko je vidljiv i kako razgovaramo jedni sa drugima, barem mi u Berlinu, ne uzimamo dovoljno ozbiljno. Mi u principu na njih odgovaramo istim kriterijumima koje primenjujemo kada se radi o tome koga pozivamo od umetnika da učestvuje na našim izložbama i koga od govornika pozivamo da učestvuje na našim panel diskusijama. Pošto je upotreba jezika u ovim kriterijumima dominantno zastupljena – upravo sve veća ili čak ponovo opadajuća afirmacija kulturnog kao ekonomskog faktora u nadmetanju urbanih prostora i njihovih stanovnika – ustvari nam nedostaje drugih iskustava da bismo proizveli situaciju kolektivnog govora. Na određen način koncept eksperta je prožeo sve formate proizvodnje znanja, izlaganja iskustva i tako dalje. Možda to mora ponovo da se kaže, da figura eksperta ne dolazi iz nauke, već iz fabrika*, iz paradigme samooptimalizacije.

Ono što me interesuje je kako treba da se nosimo sa disfunkcionalnim situacijama govora u kojima se danas ponovo nalazimo. Mislim na frustraciju, iscrpljivanje, osećaj suvišnosti, nemoć da na to što nas pogađa odgovorimo. I pošto se ova iskustva vraćaju u pisanju – a time i nemoć da na ovo primanje kritičkih gestova, kanonizacije pisanja i govora, reagujemo. Korišćenje upitnika, što je bio povod za debatu u januaru prošle godine, podseća me na to da su formati koje upotrebljavamo odlučujući za to koja iskustva mogu da budu artikulisana, a koja moraju da ostanu neartikulisana. Kroz njih se obraćamo svojim iskustvima. To ima veze i sa vremenom. Zar se ne reprodukuju društveni odnosi u našim formama znanja takođe uz pomoć vremenskih struktura? Koja oblici vremena određuju formate naše kritike? Vreme, na primer, koje pisanje zahteva? Ne u opštem smislu i da li ga ima dovoljno. Već određeno iskustvo vremena – unutar ili izvan institucija, kod kuće, među prijateljima, u kolektivima, u javnom prostoru i tako dalje.

Zašto dakle da se ponovo vratimo na pismo iz... kada se pitamo kako odgovoriti na društvenu situaciju koja nam je slična, ali koju drugačije doživljavamo? Sigurno zato, jer debata u REX-u takođe skreće pažnju na to da moramo ponovo odlučno da preispitamo i obradimo formate i načine kako ih koristimo da artikuliramo i podelimo svoje iskustvo. Pismo iz... zasniva kosmopolitizam i jezičku barijeru te upotrebe, jer preko njega dolaze u dodir dva iskustva vremena. Vreme neodređene

situacije iz koje je napisano i vreme koje sa čitalaštvom deli u svom apelu na solidarnost.

Možda je onda dovoljno ovde dodati još par praktičnih pitanja: Koje vreme zahteva i otelovljuje naša kritika? I kada ustrajno aktualiziranje našeg znanja o uslovima vlastitog rada više nije dovoljno, koja iskustva, uključujući ona koja nedostaju, moramo još da tematizujemo? Koja prisvajanja i odricanja stavljamo na kocku formatima kojima se služimo? Kako hoćemo da u budućnosti internacionalizujemo svoje debate? Kako da danas praktikujemo solidarnost?

*Mauricio Lazarato. Stvaranje zaduženog čoveka (Maurizio Lazzarato, The Making of Indebted Man).

Prevod sa engleskog: Vanja Savić

Conversations about cultural policies and the artist's condition turn me into the same state as when my father tried explaining me astrophysics: both intense curiosity and interest, and a vertiginous feeling of individual existence fragility. Attending the presentation of the results of the artists' residency project and the discussion with Bojana Piškur and Đorđe Balmazović at Cultural Center Rex last January made me dive into an intense questioning of the very general public cultural policy problematics as well as personal issues of freedom in artistic creation.

The situation of cultural workers in Serbia is very precarious. The survey conducted by Bojana Piškur and Đorđe Balmazović made it clear that Serbian artists and cultural workers have existential difficulties, no social security, low remuneration level, difficulty to assert requests to institutions, lack of togetherness, absence of trade unions...

In order to improve this situation, it seems important to develop alternative solutions and to appeal to solidarity when establishing contact with the institutions, so that independent voices from the cultural field can be heard on a more general level, not only internally, and be considered as an important matter of the public sector.

Being quite ignorant about Serbian cultural policies history and context, I had to compare those issues to the French institutional context - of which I also have a very partial knowledge.

During the XX century, France built an enormous cultural policy apparatus, in accordance with the idea that culture is part of the public sector, and has to be supported by state institutions. To speak about choreography as a field - it is the one I know best - many public institutions were founded in the 1980s (national choreographic centers - CCN, national schools, national dance center, regional artistic committees...). This system allowed for some significant steps such as the appearance of subsidized companies, promotion of cultural accessibility, the creation of the specific status of the intermittence (specific unemployment insurance system)....

Although there are lots of advantages to that system, it is nowadays clear that the extreme institutionalization of the field brought with it some complex questions for the sustainability of independent companies: this sort of organizing has not been free of perverting side effects, and it's

nowadays very difficult to get into this official support network as an active independent choreographer.

Intermittence for example - social insurance which is guaranteed for artists that have worked 507 paid hours in 10 and a half months - sounds a great system in theory, but in fact, many people have to run after jobs that are not really fitting to their skills (for example, wearing a Mickey costume at Eurodisney, or dancing in a strip club) in order to fulfill the quota and benefit from this social care.

I also have a feeling that in France everything begins and ends with bureaucratic demands, so that many supported choreographers are good producers and/or administrators rather than interesting artists, whereas lots of interesting artists have difficulties in building an administrative strategy which would help them to receive support and recognition. I have to say that most "official" choreographers are doing very blend work.

On the other hand, being independent on French scene means that you are working for free most of the time, it means self-production, even paying to get studios to work. There is less space for what are called "emerging artists", and institutional filters make it very difficult to get support at that scale.

Entering the official choreographic circuit usually begins with asking support for a specific piece one or 2 years in advance, a production which is meant to be a repeatable object, usually built on a specific thematic. Most of the work I am doing deals with improvisation and happens through long terms collaborations, which makes it very difficult to adapt to this "project" framing.

I was thinking a lot about those issues while listening to conversations in Belgrade: how to motivate the public sector to support culture without imposing too much formatting on the artists? How to acquire certain sustainability without losing freedom? I have the dizzy feeling those are lifelong question for any person working in that field. Which connects to a larger problematic for which I am afraid I do not have enough philosophical, economical and sociological competences to dig properly into.

Fighting on an institutional level for more rights, economic means and social recognition, is logic dynamic for workers who lack security and rights. So yes, cultural workers should fight to gain social rights, but this also means questioning the very definition which is the foundation of work and right.

It is something that we tend to forget when we debate among the arty crowds, but the social recognition of cultural and artistic labor is still - and maybe has to be - a burning issue in the broader society: I can't even count how many people told me that dance/choreography can't be a job. When I talk with people from another field and they ask me what do I do for life, the answer "performer", "dancer" or "choreographer" immediately triggers the questions "But do you earn your living from that?"

I don't think this discourse should be considered as conservative: I think it's a very good point to think about how the notion of work is built and evaluated in most western societies (speaking on such a general level gives me headache, but I have to do so for a bit).

If my artistic creation demands to be recognized as labor, then it enters an economical field / institutional frame which is possibly requesting me to fulfill some external conditions.

On what basis can we claim that culture / art fields can be a paying job, while still allowing the practitioners to keep their freedom and independence? This complex question gets even more intense when I realize that most of the artists I love are not supported by official discourses, institutions, but belong to an economically weak, parallel economy. In France, where lots of money is spend on culture, its distribution is very controlled, and very few funded people manage to keep independence and freedom in their work.

From ongoing discussions I have with pairs and people from the field, it is clear that the only thing which might improve those conditions is to establish more contact between public institutions and art/culture workers. A few syndicates exist here, but they are not really adapted to the needs of the independent scene: in Belgrade I was considering what has to be the minimal motivation and agreement towards shaping a collective claim.

Also, the question of political engagement that was debated at Rex raised some fundamental questions for me: what does engagement mean? How to think about effects of our narrow activities in the larger society?

I was thinking a lot of the project by Milan Markovic and Maja Pelevic, which is for me a very strong emblematic gesture stating that creation can actually affect the social and political fiber, as the conditions for its existence are embedded in the wider society.

Those are the wide and naïve observations that this Rex debate rose for me. Many questions, many doubts, few thoughts, and no answers.

Selin Larer

Razgovori o kulturnim politikama i položaju umetnika me dovode u isto stanje kao kada je moj otac pokušavao da mi objasni astrofiziku: istovremeno izazivaju u meni intenzivnu radoznalost i interesovanje, spojene sa vrtoglavim doživljajem krhkosti individualnog postojanja. Prisustvovanje prezentaciji rezultata projekta rezidencije umetnika, kao i diskusija sa Bojanom Piškur i Đorđem Balmazovićem u Kulturnom centru Rex prošlog januara, naterali su me da zaronim u intenzivno ispitivanje uopštene problematike javne kulturne politike i ličnih pitanja slobode u umetničkom stvaralaštvu.

Situacija u kojoj se nalaze kulturni radnici u Srbiji je izuzetno nesigurna. Anketa koju su sprovedi Bojana Piškur i Đorđe Balzamović je na jasan način pokazala da srpski umetnici i kulturni radnici imaju egzistencijalne poteškoće, da nemaju socijalnu zaštitu, da su slabo plaćeni, da teško nameću svoje zahteve institucijama, da im manjka zajedništva i da ne postoje strukovni sindikati.

Kako bi se ova situacija popravila, čini se da je važno razviti alternativna rešenja i osloniti se na solidarnost prilikom kontakta sa institucijama, kako bi se nezavisni glasovi na polju kulture čuli na jednom opštijem nivou od unutrašnjeg, i kako bi bili prihvaćeni kao važno pitanje za celokupan javni sektor.

Budući prilično neupućena u istoriju i kontekst srpskih kulturnih politika, bila sam prinuđena da upoređujem ove probleme sa kontekstom francuskih institucija, s kojima sam takođe samo delimično upoznata. Tokom čitavog XX veka, Francuska je gradila ogroman aparat kulturne politike, u skladu sa idejom da je kultura deo javnog sektora i da mora dobiti podršku državnih institucija. Kada je reč o polju koreografije - a to je polje sa kojim sam najbolje upoznata - mnoge javne institucije su osnovane tokom osamdesetih godina prošlog veka (nacionalni koreografski centri - CCN, nacionalne škole, nacionalni centar za ples, regionalni umetnički komiteti...) Sistem je omogućavao određene značajne korake kao što je pojavljivanje subvencionisanih trupa, promocija dostupnosti kulture i stvaranje specifičnog statusa intermitentno (sporadično) zaposlenog koji znači poseban sistem pomoći prilikom nezaposlenosti.

Iako taj sistem ima mnoge prednosti, danas je jasno da je ekstremna institucionalizacija ovog polja otvorila određena kompleksna pitanja vezana za održivost nezavisnih trupa: ovakva organizacija nije lišena

kontraindikacija koje je izvitoperavaju, pa je tako danas izuzetno teško ući u zvaničnu mrežu ako ste aktivni kao nezavisan koreograf.

Intermitencija, na primer – garantovano socijalno osiguranje za svakog umetnika koji je radio 507 plaćenih sati tokom 10 i po meseci – zvuči kao odličan sistem, ali u stvari, mnogi ljudi moraju da jure poslove koji ne odgovaraju njihovim umećima (na primer, da budu u kostimu Mikija u Eurodizniju ili da plešu u striptiz klubovima) da bi ispunili kvotu sati i ostvarili pravo na socijalnu pomoć.

Takođe, meni se čini da su u Francuskoj birokratski zahtevi sve i svja, tako da su mnogi koreografi koji učestvuju u ovom sistemu dobri producenti i/ili administratori pre nego zanimljivi umetnici, dok mnogi zanimljivi umetnici imaju poteškoće u izgradnji administrativne strategije koje će im omogućiti da dobiju podršku i priznanje. Moram da kažem da većina „zvaničnih“ koreografa ima prilično neupečatljive rezultate.

S druge strane, nezavisnost na francuskoj sceni znači da veći deo vremena radite besplatno, u sopstvenoj produkciji, ako ne čak i plaćajući za studijski prostor za rad. Daleko je manje prostora za takozvane „dolazeće umetnike“, a institucionalni filteri umnogome otežavaju dobijanje podrške na tom nivou.

Ulaženje u krug zvaničnih koreografa uglavnom počinje traženjem podrške, godinu ili dve unapred, za konkretno delo koje je zamišljeno kao objekat koji se može ponoviti, uglavnom izgrađen oko specifične tematike. Veći deo mojih radova se bavi improvizacijom i ostvaruje kroz dugoročnu saradnju, što ih čini izuzetno teškim za smeštanje u ovakav „projektni“ okvir.

Puno sam razmišljala o ovim pitanjima dok sam slušala razgovore u Beogradu: kako privoleti javni sektor da podržava kulturu, a da previše ne nameće određene formate umetnicima? Kako ostvariti određen stepen održivosti bez gubitka slobode? Imam vrtoglavi osećaj da su to pitanja na koja svaka osoba koja stvara u tom polju mora da odgovara čitav svoj život. To se uvezuje sa širom problematikom u koju se plašim da zađem jer za to nemam dovoljno filozofskih niti ekonomskih niti socioloških kompetencija.

Borba za veća prava, ekonomska sredstva i društveno priznanje na institucionalnom nivou logična je dinamika za radnike koji nemaju sigurnost niti prava. Dakle, da, kulturni radnici bi trebalo da se bore kako bi stekli socijalna prava, ali to takođe zahteva preispitivanje samih definišućih postulata rada i prava.

To je stvar koju često zaboravljamo kada raspravljamo unutar umetničkih

krugova, ali društveno priznanje kulturnog i umetničkog rada je još uvek – a možda tako i treba da bude – goruće pitanje društva uopšte. Ni sama ne zam koliko puta su mi ljudi rekli da ples/koreografija ne može da bude posao. Kada diskutujem sa ljudima iz nekog drugog polja i oni me pitaju čime se bavim, odgovor „izvođačica“, „plesaćica“ ili „koreografkinja“ služi kao trenutni okidač za pitanje „Ali, da li od toga zarađuješ dovoljno za život?“

Nisam mišljenja da bi takav diskurs trebalo olako prihvatiti kao isključivo konzervativan: mislim da je uputno razmišljati od tome kako se stvara i procenjuje pojam rada u većini zapadnjačkih društava (zadaje mi glavobolju što pričam tako generalizovano, ali moram to da učinim, samo na kratko). Ako moje umetničko stvaralaštvo zahteva da bude priznato kao rad, onda ono stupa u ekonomsko polje/institucionalni okvir koji verovatno traži od mene da ispunim određene eksterno postavljene uslove.

Na osnovu čega možemo tvrditi da polja kulture i umetnosti mogu da budu plaćen posao, istovremeno omogućavajući radnicima da zadrže slobodu i nezavisnost? Ovo komplikovano pitanje postaje još intenzivnije kada uzmem u obzir to da većina umetnika koje volim ne uživa podršku zvaničnih diskursa, institucija, nego pripadaju jednoj slabashnoj, paralelnoj ekonomiji. U Francuskoj, gde se mnogo novca troši na kulturu, njegova raspodela je izuzetno kontrolisana, i mali broj onih koji dobiju pristup fondovima uspeva i da zadrži nezavisnost i slobodu u svom radu.

Iz tekućih diskusija koje vodim sa ljudima iz ovog polja, postaje jasno da je jedino što može da poboljša ove uslove stvaranje jačeg kontakta između javnih institucija i umetnika/kulturnih radnika. Ovde postoji nekoliko sindikata, ali oni nisu prilagođeni potrebama nezavisne scene: u Beogradu sam razmišljala o tome šta bi bio minimum motivacije i saglasnosti oko oblikovanja zajedničkog zahteva.

Takođe, pitanje političkog angažmana koje je bilo tema debate u REXu nateralo me je da i ja sama sebi postavim određena fundamentalna pitanja. Šta znači angažman? Kako razmišljati o efektima naših uskih aktivnosti na šire društvo?

Puno sam razmišljala o projektu Milana Markovića i Maje Pelević, koji za mene predstavlja veoma jak, simbolički gest kojim se iznosi tvrdnja da stvaralaštvo zaista može da utiče na društveno i političko tkivo, pošto su uslovi za njegovo postojanje ugrađeni u šire društvo.

To su moje široke i naivne opservacije na osnovu debate u REXu. Mnogo pitanja, mnogo sumnji, tek poneka misao, bez odgovora.

Bojana Piškur

born in Ljubljana, Slovenia. She graduated in art history from the University of Ljubljana and received her Ph.D. at the Institute for Art History at the Charles University in Prague, the Czech Republic. She works as a senior curator in the Museum of Contemporary Art Metelkova (Museum of Modern Art in Ljubljana). Her main theme of research is experimental art contexts/concepts/forms/relations in wider social environment. She is a member of Radical Education Collective.

rođena u Ljubljani, Slovenija. Diplomirala istoriju umetnosti na Univerzitetu u Ljubljani. Doktorat odbranila na Institutu za istoriju umetnosti na Karlovom univerzitetu u Pragu, Češka. Zaposlena kao viši kustos Muzeja savremene umetnosti Metelkova, u Ljubljani. Osnovna oblast njenog istraživanja su eksperimentalni umetnički konteksti/koncepti/forme/odnosi u širem društvenom okruženju. Članica je Kolektiva Radikalna Edukacija (Radical Education Collective).

Zoran Pantelić

umetnik, edukator i producent. Osnivač asocijacije Apsolutno 1993. (www.apsolutno.net), koja je delovala na polju interdisciplinarnih umetničkih projekata i medijskog pluralizma, u različitim formatima (video, štampa, instalacije, akcije, site-specific, audio, web). Od 1995. godine učestvuje na internacionalnim simpozijumima i konferencijama kao gostujući predavač na univerzitetima širom Evrope (Beč, Maastricht, Berlin, Amsterdam, Dessau, Sarajevo, Helsinki, Moskva itd). Umetničku aktivnost i iskustvo je 2000. godine transferisao i integrisao u nove oblike za kreiranje uslova i propitivanje umetničke produkcije i umetničkog organizovanja – Centar_kuda.org (www.kuda.org). Kolektiv_kuda.org je posvećen novim tehnologijama, istraživanju, umetnosti i politici.

artist, producer, educator. Founded artistic association Apsolutno (Absolutely) in 1993. The art collective was active in the nineties in the field of interdisciplinary artprojects and media pluralism (www.apsolutno.net). Apsolutno art production was presented in numerous exhibitions, festivals and symposiums in the country and abroad. Since 1995 he participated in international symposia and conferences dealing with the culture of new media. In 2001 he founded and since has been running the Center for new media_kuda.org dedicated to new technologies, art and politics (www.kuda.org). Centar_kuda.org brings together artists, theoreticians, media activists, researchers from a wide field of interests. Zoran Pantelić participates in collaborative practices as a curator, editor, producer, author, etc.

Saša Pančić

Rođen u Mostaru 1965. Po završetku srednje Pravno-birotehničke škole, 1984. upisuje Fakultet likovnih umetnosti u Beogradu, odsek slikarstvo, koji završava 1989. Postdiplomske studija za crtež na istom fakultetu završava 1992. U statusu samostalnog umetnika je od 1986, a član ULUSa od 1992.

Od 2007 do 2009. se nalazio na funkciji predsednika ULUSa, od 2009. do 2011, bio je urednik likovnog programa galerije O3on, Beograd, 2011. likovni urednik BELEFa i osnivač fondacije „OBALA“.

Priredio je 19 samostalnih i izlagao na više grupnih izložbi u zemlji i inostranstvu (Hrvatska, Finska, Rusija, Francuska, Japan, Bugarska, Tajland, Austrija). Ima više radova izvedenih u javnom prostoru (Bugarska, Laponija, Srbija) Živi i radi u Beogradu.

Born in Mostar in 1965. After finishing secondary education at the School for Legal and Administrative Assistants, he enrolled at the Faculty of Fine Arts, the Department of Painting in 1984, where he graduated in 1989. He completed a postgraduate course in drawing at the same faculty in 1992. Saša Pančić obtained the status of an individual artist in 1986. He has been a member of the Association of Visual Artists of Serbia (ULUS) since 1992.

He was the president of ULUS from 2007 to 2009. From 2009 - 2011, he was art event manager at O3one Gallery in Belgrade. In 2011, he selected art events showcased at the BELEF festival. Saša Pančić is the founder of the OBALA (SHORE) foundation. He has held 19 solo and a number of group exhibitions in the country and abroad, namely, in Croatia, Finland, Russia, Japan, Bulgaria, Thailand, Austria. Several of his works were shown in public spaces in Bulgaria, Lapland and Serbia. He lives and works in Belgrade.

Marijana Cvetković

je diplomirala istoriju umetnosti u Beogradu. Magistrirala iz oblasti menadžmenta u kulturi i kulturne politike (u Beogradu i Lionu). Trenutno je doktorant na Univerzitetu umetnosti u Beogradu (menadžment i razvoj muzeja). Inicirala je i realizovala različite programe i projekte iz oblasti kulturne politike, međunarodne i balkanske kulturne saradnje i vizuelnih umetnosti, muzeja... Suosnivačica „Stanice - servisa za savremeni ples“ i „Plesne akademije Nomad“, balkanske platforme za razvoj savremenog plesa i izvođačkih umetnosti. Aktivistkinja u domenu kulture na nezavisnim kulturnim scenama u Beogradu i Srbiji. Predavač na Univerzitetu umetnosti u Beogradu.

graduated in art history (Belgrade) earned her M.A. degree in management in culture and cultural policy (Belgrade and Lyon). Currently a PhD candidate at the University of Arts in Belgrade (museum management and development). Initiated and carried out various programmes and projects in the fields of cultural policy, international and Balkan cultural cooperation, contemporary dance and visual arts, museums... Co-founder of Station Service for Contemporary Dance and Nomad Dance Academy, a Balkan platform for the development of contemporary dance and performing arts. Cultural activist in independent cultural scenes in Belgrade and Serbia. Lecturer at the University of Arts in Belgrade.

Marko Miletić

je apsolvant na studijama Istorije umetnosti na Filozofskom fakultetu u Beogradu, radnik u kulturi, član Kontekst kolektiva. Od 2007. do 2010. radio na projektu Kontekst galerija, povremeno piše za različite medije. Svoj rad vidi kao stvaranje prostora za kritičko i političko delovanje u polju savremene umetnosti i kulture, a trenutno je se najviše bavi razmatranjem odnosa politike i kulturne produkcije; kao i pitanjima materijalnog i radnog položaja radnika u kulturi.

is student on The Department of Art History of The Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, cultural worker, member of Kontekst collective. From 2007 to 2010, he has been working on Kontekst gallery project; occasionally he writes for different medias. He addresses his work as creating a space for critical and political action in the field of contemporary art and culture. His current topic is relation between politics and cultural production; as well as the issue of material and labor conditions of the cultural workers.

Jelena Vesić

je nezavisna kustoskinja, kulturna aktivistkinja, autorka, urednica i predavačica, koja živi i radi u Beogradu i internacionalno. Kourednica časopisa Prelom - Časopis za sliku i politiku, Beograd 2001-2009 i jedna od osnivača Prelom Kolektiva, Beograd 2005-2011. Jedna od osnivača mreže nezavisnih organizacija Druga Scena, Beograd, od 2005/6. Kourednica žurnala Red Thread - Žurnal za društvenu teoriju, savremenu umetnost i aktivizam, od 2009. i članica redakcije časopisa Art Margins za umetnost i teoriju (MIT Press) od 2011. Njeno istraživanje je posvećeno politikama reprezentacije u umetnosti i vizuelnoj kulturi, praksama samoorganizacije i politizacije kulturnog rada. U svojoj kustoskoj

praksi često eksperimentiše sa različitim formatima, metodologijama, kontekstualnim i kolaborativnim aspektima umetnosti.

is independent curator, cultural activist, writer, editor and lecturer who lives and works in Belgrade and abroad. She was co-editor of *Prelom – Journal of Images and Politics* (Belgrade) 2001-2009, founding member of independent organization *Prelom Collective* (Belgrade) 2005-2010 and founding member of the network of independent organizations *Other Scene*, Belgrade since 2005/6. She is also co-editor of *Red Thread – Journal for social theory, contemporary art and activism*, (Istanbul) since 2009 and member of editorial board of *Art Margins* (MIT Press). Jelena Vesic's research is dedicated to the politics of representation in art and visual culture, practices of self-organization and politicization of cultural work. Her curatorial practice often experiments with frameworks, methodologies, and contextual and collaborative aspects of art.

Inga Zimprich

artist, has worked together with Sönke Hallmann as Faculty of Invisibility since 2006. They address contemporary (art-)institution and question what it means to come to speak within it. Faculty of Invisibility holds internal meetings, such as *The Speech* (2006), *Public Voice* (2010) and *Assembly* (2010) and publishes its correspondence in the form of a letter series, posters, records or newspapers. Since 2009, Inga has been a board member of *Flutgraben e.V.*, a large studio complex in Berlin which is run collectively. The programming group (with Janine Eisenächer, Lydia Hamann, Sönke Hallmann, Jo Zahn et al) aims to dedicate the building's common areas to self-organized, emancipatory practices.

zajedno sa Zonkeom Halmanom, radi na projektu "Fakultet nevidljivosti" od 2006. godine. Bave se institucijom savremene umetnosti i postavljaju pitanje šta znači istupiti i govoriti unutar njenih okvira. „Fakultet nevidljivosti“ održava interne sastanke, među kojima su *Govor* (2006), *Glas javnosti* (2010) i *Skupština* (2010) i objavljuje svoju korespondenciju u obliku niza pisama, postera, zapisnika ili novina. Od 2009. godine, Inga je član odbora velikog kompleksa ateljea u Berlinu, koji je pod kolektivnom upravom organizacije „Flutgraben e.V.“. Grupa zadužena za programe (u kojoj su i Janina Ajzenaher, Lidija Halman, Zonke Halman, Džo Zan i drugi) ima za cilj da se zajedničke prostorije u zgradi koriste za emancipatorske prakse koje su plod samoorganizovanja.

Sönke Hallmann

theorist, founded the Department of Reading in 2006, a reading platform that addresses moments of collectivity within our acts of reading and deconstructs the concept of authorship prevalent in the academic writing. *Echo's Book* (2010) assembles the different experiences of reading collectively that occurred during the Symposium for Readers (2007). Together with Inga Zimprich, he conducts the Faculty of Invisibility, whose recent productions address the questions of hearing, as well as subjective modalities and bodily aspects of institutional critique. Sönke Hallmann is part of the acting board of *Flutgraben e.V.*, which runs a large self-organized studio complex in Berlin. Within the program *Inverse Institution*, *Flutgraben* dedicates its common areas to collective, self-organized artistic practices.

Teoretičar, Zonke Halman je osnovao Katedru za čitanje 2006. godine, platformu za čitanje koja se bavi trenucima kolektivnog unutar naših činova čitanja i dovodi do dekonstrukcije pojma autorstva koji preovlađuje u akademskim spisima. U Knjizi eha (2010) su sakupljena različita iskustva kolektivnog čitanja nastala tokom Simpozijuma za čitaoce (2007). Zajedno sa Ingom Cimprich, vodi Fakultet nevidljivosti, čija se skorašnja delatnost fokusira na pitanja slušanja, kao i na subjektivne modalitete i telesne aspekte institucionalne kritike. Zonke Halman je član v.d. odbora organizacije „Flutgraben e.V.“, koja upravlja velikim kompleksom ateljea u Berlinu, zasnovanom na principima samoorganizovanja. U okviru programa *Inverzija institucije*, *Flutgraben* omogućava da se zajedničke prostorije u zgradi koriste za umetničke prakse koje su plod samoorganizovanja.

Céline Larrère

was raised on cow's milk and ballet in deep countryside, before moving to Paris east side. Studied savage contemporary dance, oyster philosophy and hairy ethnology. Escaped from Folkwang Hochschule. Attended *Nomad Dance Academy* 2009 in the Balkans. Fell in love with aikido. Dug in improvisation and instant composition with Simone Forti, Andrew Morrish, Rosalind Crisp, Martin Sonderkamp, Benoît Lachambre, Deborah Hay, Meredith Monk, Helen Herbertson, Thomas Hauert, Isabelle Schad. Non-phallic member of *les Moric(h)ettes*, guilty of suspicious improvisation performances. *DanceWebber* 2011 / Île-de-France / Adami scholar recipient / choreographer of *Prototype* programme at *Fondation Royaumont* 2013-14 /// *SPEAP* MA student - experimental programme in arts and politics, dir. Bruno Latour. Performer for *Martha Rodezno*, Igor Koruga, Zeina Hanna, Aurélie Gandit.

Selin Larer je odrasla na kravljem mleku i baletu u dubokoj provinciji, a zatim se preselila u Pariz na istočnu obalu. Studirala je divlji savremeni ples, filozofiju ostriga i dlakavu etnologiju. Pobjegla je iz Folkwang Hochschule. 2009. godine je pohađala Nomad Dance Academy na Balkanu. Zaljubila se u aikido. Udubila se u improvizaciju i instant kompoziciju, zajedno sa Simon Forti, Endrjuom Morišom, Rozalind Krisp, Martinom Zonderkampom, Benoom Lašambrom, Deborom Hej, Meredit Mank, Helen Herbertson, Tomasom Hauertom i Izabel Šad. Ona je nefalusni član plesne trupe „Les Moric(h)ettes“, kriva je za sumnjive improvizacije u obliku performansa. Dobitnica je stipendija DanceWebber 2011 / Île-de-France / Adami. Koreografkinja programa Prototip u organizaciji Fondacije Roajomon (Fondation Royaumont) u sezoni 2013-14. U okviru master studija, učestvuje u programu SPEAP, posvećenom eksperimentima u domenu umetnosti i politike, pod vođstvom Bruna Latura. Nastupala sa Martom Rodezno, Igorom Korugom, Zeinom Hanom i Oreli Gandi.

**U MAŠINSKOM ODELJENJU:
USLOVI RADA U KULTURI 2 /**

**Prezentacija rezultata umetničke rezidencije u okviru
projekta "Raskršća Istok Zapad" i razgovor sa
Bojanom Piškur i Đorđem Balmazovićem**

**IN THE ENGINE ROOM:
CONDITIONS OF WORKING IN CULTURE 2 /**
**Presentation of the results of artists' residency project
and discussion with
Bojana Piškur and Đorđe Balmazović**

Tekstovi učesnika i učesnica debate
u Kulturnom centru REX 29. januara 2013
Essays by participants in the debate held in
Rex Cultural Centre on January 29th 2013

Ova publikacija je nastala kao rezultat projekta "Raskršća istok zapad" koji je
Fond B92/Kulturni centar Rex realizovao u periodu od aprila 2011. do maja 2014.
godine u okviru projekta "Engine Room Europe" realizovanog zajedno sa još 11
centara iz Evropske mreže nezavisnih kulturnih centara - Trans Europe Halles.

This publication was created as a result of the Crossroads East West project,
realized by Fund B92/Rex Cultural Centre in the period of April 2011 to
May 2014 as a part of "Engine Room Europe", a project realized in coopera-
tion with 11 other centers in the Trans Europe Halles - European network
of independent cultural centers.

Tekstovi / **Contributors:** Bojana Piškur, Zoran Pantelić, Saša Pančić,
Marijana Cvetković, Marko Miletić, Jelena Vesić, Inga Zimprich, Sönke
Hallmann, Céline Larrère

Prevod / **Translation:** Mihailo Tešić
osim gde je drugačije navedeno / unless stated otherwise

Urednik / **Editor:** Nebojša Milikić

Izdavač / **Published by:** Fond B92

Organizacija i produkcija debata i publikacije:
Fond B92/Kulturni centar Rex
Debates and publication produced and organized by:
Fund B92/Rex Cultural Centre
www.rex.b92.net

Koordinatori projekta / **Project coordinators:**
Dušica Parezanović i Nebojša Milikić

škart design

Izdavanje publikacije pomogli su Evropska komisija u okviru programa Kultura 2007 - 2013 i
Ministarstvo kulture i informisanja Republike Srbije. Debata je bila deo i "Govornih programa
KC REXa" koji su pomogli Fondacija za otvoreno društvo i Sekretarijat za kulturu grada
Beograda.

This publication was made possible with the assistance of the European Commission, as a part
of Culture 2007-2013 programme and the Ministry of Culture and Information of Serbia. The
debate was held also as part of the Talks programmes at Cultural Centre REX, supported by the
Foundation for an Open Society and the Secretariat for Culture, City of Belgrade.

Beograd 2014.

CIP - Каталогizacija u publikaciji
Narodna biblioteka Srbije, Beograd

008-051:331.101.3

U mašinskom odeljenju : uslovi rada u kulturi. 2 : prezentacija rezultata umetničke rezidencije u okviru projekta "Raskršća Istok Zapad" i razgovor sa Bojanom Piškur i Đorđem Balmazovićem = In the Engine Room : conditions of Working in Culture : presentation of the results of artists residency project and discussion with Bojana Piškur and Đorđe Balmazović / urednik, editor Nebojša Milikić ; prevod, translation Mihailo Tešić. - Beograd : Fond b92, 2014 (Beograd : Standard 2). - 80 str. ; 24 cm

Tiraž 300.

ISBN 978-86-89891-04-1

1. Уп. ств. насл.

COBISS.SR-ID 206309388



FOND
B92



Powered by:

Engine
Room
Europe



FONDACIJA ZA OTVORENO DRUŠTVO, SRBIJA
OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATION, SERBIA



Република Србија
РЕПУБЛИКА СРБИЈА



Culture
Programme

"Engine Room Europe is a three-year programme (April 2011-May 2014) of activities dedicated to independent cultural workers and their creative processes. It is initiated by Trans Europe Halles (TEH) and co-ordinated by Melkweg (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) in association with 10 co-organizing TEH members. Engine Room Europe has been funded with the support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein".