

Uvod / Introduction	2 / 3
Najava debate / Debate Announcement	4/6
Ema Dowling	9 / 10
Dušan Grlja	11 / 12
Dea Vidović Važnost istraživačkih poduhvata u polju djelovanja nevladinih organizacija u kulturi	13
<i>The importance of research projects in the field of NGO cultural activity</i>	17
Monika Mokre Some Thoughts on the Advantages and Possible Pitfalls of Co-Research	21
<i>Neka razmišljanja o prednostima i mogućim zamkama zajedničkog istraživanja</i>	26
Emil Majuk Way to the Future - Civil Society and Non-Governmental Organizations in Poland	31
<i>Put u budućnost - Civilno društvo i nevladine organizacije u Poljskoj</i>	34
Svebor Midžić	37 / 39
KRATKE BIOGRAFIJE / SHORT CVs	41

Prezentacija i debata "NVO u krizi, kriza u NVO" bile su poslednje u nizu aktivnosti koncipiranih i realizovanih u okviru projekta "Raskršća istok zapad" - Engine Room Europe (Mašinsko odeljenje Evropa) a koje su se bavile uslovima rada u kulturi. U nadi da će se kroz jedno istraživanje ovog tipa - koje je podrazumevalo i mogućnosti kreacije i improvizacije jer se odvijalo u formi umetničkog rezidencija - eventualno doći do formulisanja i afirmacije ambicioznije analitičke i kritičke vizure za sagledavanje rada i kriza ovdašnjih NVO koje se bave kulturnom i umetničkom produkcijom, ostvareno je niz kontakata, susreta i razgovora sa akterima nezavisne kulturne scene u Srbiji. Prvi utisci i rezultati diskutovani su na debati u Rexu sa koje ovde prenosimo i utiske učesnika. Čitaocima preporučujemo i posebnu publikaciju iz ove serije, sa daljim komentarima Eme Dowling o istraživanju i njime obuhvaćenim ili naznačenim problematikama.

Urednik

The presentation and the debate titled "NGO in crisis, crisis in NGO" were the last in the line of activities envisioned and produced as a part of the Crossroads East West - Engine Room Europe project and dealing with the conditions of working in culture. Hoping that this type of research - which entails the possibility to create and improvise, since it takes the form of artist residency - could lead to formulating and affirming a more ambitious analytical and critical view of labor and crises in contemporary NGOs involved in cultural and artistic production, a number of contacts, meetings and discussions with the actors on the Serbian independent cultural scene were arranged. The first results were discussed at the Rex debate, and here we present the impressions of the participants. We also recommend a special publication from this series, with further comments by Emma Dowling, regarding the research itself and the problematics it had covered and pointed at.

Editor

U MAŠINSKOM ODELJENJU 3: NVO u krizi, kriza u NVO

Kulturni centar Rex, 12. 07. 2013, 12:00

Prezentacija rezultata studijskog boravka i diskusija sa Emom Dauling i Dušanom Grljom o prvim utiscima i saznanjima upravo provedenog istraživanja aspekata funkcionisanja i delovanja nezavisnog kulturnog sektora u Srbiji.

Tokom svog studijskog boravka, Ema Dauling, aktivistkinja i predavačica sociologije na Univerzitetu Midlseks u Londonu je, zajedno sa Dušanom Grljom, sociologom i aktivistom iz Beograda, istraživala status, obim delatnosti, aktivnosti i probleme sa kojima se susreću nevladine organizacije iz sektora kulture u Srbiji.

Putem serije intervjuja sa članicama i članovima nevladinih organizacija koje pretežno deluju u polju kulturne i umetničke produkcije ali i politike, Dauling i Grlja su sa intervjuisanima istraživali i diskutovali različite aspekte misije, funkcionisanja i uslova rada ovih nevladinih organizacija, kao i promene i procese u sektoru kulture nastale usled globalne krize i pojačane partikularnim krizama lokalnog kulturnog ili NVO sektora ili krizama u samim organizacijama.

Više podataka o istraživanju možete naći na <http://www.rex.b92.net/sr/ovogmeseca/tribineDebate/story/4947/U+MA%C5%A0INSKOM+ODELJENJU+3%3A+USLOVI+RADA+KULTURNIH+RADNIKA.html>

Prezentacija i debata odvićaće se u pravcu zajedničke refleksije tri teme koje su se nametnule kao ključne tokom ovog istraživačkog postupka:

- iskustvo krize;
- politika civilnog društva i javne sfere;
- strategije, ideje i predlozi za suočavanje sa najaktuelnijim problemima sa kojima se po mišljenju intervjuisanih susreću individualno i u okviru sektora.

Ema Dauling, aktivistkinja i predavačica na Middlesex Univerzitetu u Londonu, je angažovana, između ostalih projekata, i u okviru inicijative "NVO klinika". Dušan Grlja je teoretičar i aktivista, nekadašnji član kolektiva "Prelom", a trenutno je kourednik projekta "Ilegalni bioskop" platforme "Teorija koja hoda".

Na debati će učestvovati intervjuisani članovi i članice više NVOa iz Beograda, Novog Sada, Užica i Novog Pazara koji su učestvovali u ovom istraživanju (Kontekst kolektiv, KUDA.org, NLO, CZKD, Urban In, KC Rex, Stanica, Remont, Žene u crnom, Centar za politike emancipacije, Uzbuna, Akademika, Ministarstvo prostora itd.) kao i gosti i gošće iz inostranstva koji će pokušati da reflektuju iznesenu problematiku sa stanovišta svojih iskustava i prakse: Dea Vidović (Hrvatska), Albert Heta (Kosovo), Emil Majuk (Poljska), Monika Mokre (Austrija), Parožaj Čaba (Mađarska).

Moderator: Svebor Midžić.

Prezentacija i debata će se odvijati na engleskom jeziku, a obezbeđen je prevod na srpski.

Ovaj studijski boravak i istraživanje su deo programa „Raskršća Istok-Zapad”, koji se sprovodi u okviru trogodišnjeg projekta „Mašinsko odeljenje Evropa” koji Kulturni centar REX/B92 realizuje zajedno sa još 11 evropskih kulturnih centara. Projekat je fokusiran na nezavisne radnike u kulturi i njihovo polje delovanja, a njegov glavni cilj je razvoj kapaciteta i održivosti nezavisne kulture u Evropi. Projekat „Mašinsko odeljenje Evropa” je podržan od strane Evropske komisije.

Projekat „Raskršća Istok-Zapad” se realizuje uz podršku Evropske komisije i Ministarstva kulture Republike Srbije. Debata se održava u okviru Govornih programa Kulturnog centra Rex, podržanih od strane Fondacije za otvoreno društvo i Sekretarijata za kulturu grada Beograda.

Debate Announcement

IN THE ENGINE ROOM 3: NGOs in Crisis, Crisis in NGOs

Cultural Center REX, 12. 07. 2013 12:00

Presentation of the results of artists' residency project and discussion with Emma Dowling and Dušan Grlja.

During the residency of activist and academic Emma Dowling within the project line Crossroads East-West, the activist research and debate was realized in Belgrade. Together with sociologist and activist from Belgrade Dusan Grlja, Emma Dowling was investigating the status, scope, activities and problems that NGOs in the cultural sector in Serbia are facing.

The research focused at the cultural/activist NGOs that have developed from the 1990s context onwards. Since then, there has been the development of different types of NGOs, some more political than others. According to some previous investigations, most of the problems that cultural NGOs in Serbia face are connected to the transparency regarding fund-raising and resource issues, formal constraints that shape organisations in particular ways, e.g. representational forms, internal hierarchies/decision-making issues/division of labour, daily financing/fund-raising, reproduction of the organisation etc. Several interested representative NGOs from the Association of the Independent Cultural Scene of Serbia or The Other Scene as well as other prominent NGOs were interviewed and/or consulted through a form of activist research.

Some of the questions that motivated the research include: What is it that NGOs are trying to do overall/what is their mission? Which working

conditions of cultural workers are considered most neuralgic in the present situation? The residency and research will be finalised in the open consultative debate in Rex on July 12 at 12am, which is the fourth in series dedicated to the condition of work of independent workers in culture in Serbia.

Emma Dowling is an activist and academic from Great Britain involved amongst other projects in the 'NGO Clinic' initiative. Dusan Grlja is theorist and activist, a former member of Prelom collective, currently co-editor of the Illegal Cinema project by Walking Theory.

The guests from abroad will try to throw additional light on the topic, based on their experiences and practice: Dea Vidovic (Croatia), Emil Majuk (Poland), Monika Mokre (Austria).

This residency and research belong to the Crossroads East West 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.

Crossroads East West project is supported by European Commission and Ministry of Culture of Republic Serbia. The debate is held also as part of the Talks programmes at Cultural Centre REX supported by the Foundation for an Open Society.

tek

sto



texts

Emma Dowling

So far, I had been working with a view of 'crisis' as a term that while calling out the instability of the economic system we are living in, also allows us to think and act on a possibility of change in that to designate 'crisis' is also to designate a situation that is open in terms of its trajectory or outcome, it is a moment that could go different ways. I was also aware that when referring to 'crisis' we were referring not only to the financial crisis and its fall-out since the crash of 2008, or even simply the cyclical crises of the capitalist economy, we were also referring to the crises that have been ongoing in the region and have manifested themselves in different yet interlinked ways – socially, economically and politically – charting a course of crisis and change that it could be helpful to look at. The discussion helped me to sharpen my viewpoint and my critique of crisis. This is because in the discussion, I encountered a good deal of criticism as to the framing of the project in terms of 'crisis'. Therefore, I came away from the discussion thinking not so much what the lens of 'crisis' opens up, but also what the lens 'crisis' closes down and equally makes impossible: in what ways does the notion of 'crisis' become a kind of paralysis for thinking and enacting change? When 'crisis' becomes normalised, it runs the risk of grounding - a way of remaining stuck in a present that never comes to pass into any kind of possible future; one is always firefighting, one is always 'managing', one is in a permanent state of anxiety, of not knowing, and ultimately of not being OK. This can become coupled with a notion of 'crisis' as simply a process of coping, which is less orientated to bringing about change and more about trying to 'muddle through'. When 'crisis' becomes normalised, does that mean that the possibility for change becomes an abstraction, because crisis is not a moment of transition, but a finite point of permanency? In turn, if speaking about 'crisis' becomes a 'safe' and 'academic' position to speak from, what does 'safe' mean? Does it mean the imposition of a certain lens onto a given situation, as different from arriving at a set of problematics to be investigated? And indeed, if we are asking questions about crisis, needn't we be more precise in asking, 'crisis for whom' and 'crisis in relation to what'? It seems that right now is that through crisis and its material social, political and economic manifestations, people are being divided and pitted against one another once again in new and different ways across Europe and along the borders of the EU. Crisis, then, as both a common and differentiating experience within individual nation-states and transnationally across regions, is to my mind an important field of further investigation.

tek

sto



texts

Emma Dowling

So far, I had been working with a view of 'crisis' as a term that while calling out the instability of the economic system we are living in, also allows us to think and act on a possibility of change in that to designate 'crisis' is also to designate a situation that is open in terms of its trajectory or outcome, it is a moment that could go different ways. I was also aware that when referring to 'crisis' we were referring not only to the financial crisis and its fall-out since the crash of 2008, or even simply the cyclical crises of the capitalist economy, we were also referring to the crises that have been ongoing in the region and have manifested themselves in different yet interlinked ways – socially, economically and politically – charting a course of crisis and change that it could be helpful to look at. The discussion helped me to sharpen my viewpoint and my critique of crisis. This is because in the discussion, I encountered a good deal of criticism as to the framing of the project in terms of 'crisis'. Therefore, I came away from the discussion thinking not so much what the lens of 'crisis' opens up, but also what the lens 'crisis' closes down and equally makes impossible: in what ways does the notion of 'crisis' become a kind of paralysis for thinking and enacting change? When 'crisis' becomes normalised, it runs the risk of grounding - a way of remaining stuck in a present that never comes to pass into any kind of possible future; one is always firefighting, one is always 'managing', one is in a permanent state of anxiety, of not knowing, and ultimately of not being OK. This can become coupled with a notion of 'crisis' as simply a process of coping, which is less orientated to bringing about change and more about trying to 'muddle through'. When 'crisis' becomes normalised, does that mean that the possibility for change becomes an abstraction, because crisis is not a moment of transition, but a finite point of permanency? In turn, if speaking about 'crisis' becomes a 'safe' and 'academic' position to speak from, what does 'safe' mean? Does it mean the imposition of a certain lens onto a given situation, as different from arriving at a set of problematics to be investigated? And indeed, if we are asking questions about crisis, needn't we be more precise in asking, 'crisis for whom' and 'crisis in relation to what'? It seems that right now is that through crisis and its material social, political and economic manifestations, people are being divided and pitted against one another once again in new and different ways across Europe and along the borders of the EU. Crisis, then, as both a common and differentiating experience within individual nation-states and transnationally across regions, is to my mind an important field of further investigation.

U dosadašnjem radu sam posmatrala „krizu“ kao pojam koji nam, zazivajući nestabilnost ekonomskog sistema u kome živimo, takođe omogućava da promišljamo i delamo u cilju mogućnosti promene, u smislu da je odrednica „krize“ takođe i odrednica za situaciju koja je otvorena po pitanju trajektorije ili ishoda, jedan momenat koji bi mogao da se razreši na različite načine. Takođe sam bila svesna toga da, misleći na „krizu“, ne mislimo samo na finansijsku krizu i njene posledice od kraha 2008. do danas, pa čak ne ni na ciklične krize kapitalističke privrede, nego mislimo i na krize koje traju u regionu i manifestuju se na različite, ali ipak povezane načine – društveno, ekonomski i politički – čime mapiramo svojevrsan tok kriza i promena koji bi mogao biti od pomoći ako tu mapu proučimo. Debata mi je pomogla da izoštrim svoju tačku gledišta i kritiku krize, pre svega tako što sam se tokom diskusije susrela sa dosta kritika na račun definisanja projekta putem pojma „krize“. Debata me je zato navela na razmišljanje – ne toliko o tome šta otkriva gledanje kroz prizmu „krize“, već i o tome šta prizma „krize“ zatvara i jednako čini nemogućim; na koje načine pojam „krize“ postaje svojevrsna paraliza mišljenja i stvaranja promene? Kada „kriza“ postane normalizovana, rizikuje se određeno uzemljenje – ostajanje zaglavljenim u sadašnjosti koja se nikad ne ostvaruje u bilo kakvoj mogućoj budućnosti; čovek stalno mora da gasi požar, stalno da bude „menadžer“, u stalnom je stanju anksioznosti, neznanja, i konačno, neprijatnosti. Može se dogoditi da se ovo upari sa pojmom „krize“ jednostavno sagledanim kao proces izlaska na kraj, koji je manje okrenut ka stvaranju promene, a više ka tome da se čovek nekako „promuva“. Kada „kriza“ postane normalizovana, da li to znači da mogućnost promene postaje apstrakcija, jer kriza nije momenat tranzicije, nego konačna tačka permanentnosti? Sa druge strane, ako govoriti o „krizi“ postaje „bezbedna“ i „akademska“ pozicija govora, šta „bezbedno“ tačno znači? Da li to znači nametanje određene prizme na datu situaciju, umesto dosezanja skupa problematika koje bi trebalo istražiti? I zaista, ako već postavljamo pitanja o krizi, ne bi li trebalo da budemo precizniji i upitamo „kriza za koga“ i „kriza u odnosu na šta“? Čini se da se u ovom trenutku putem krize i njenih materijalnih društvenih, političkih i ekonomskih pojava izazivaju podele i zavade među ljudima na nove i drugačije načine, širom Evrope i duž granica EU. Kriza je, stoga, i kao zajedničko i kao diferencirajuće iskustvo, kako u okviru pojedinačnih nacionalnih država, tako i transnacionalno, širom različitih regiona, prema mome mišljenju značajno polje za dalje istraživanje.

Bio sam pomalo skeptičan kada sam saznao da će javna debata na temu projekta biti održana odmah posle obavljenih 15 intervjuva za 10 dana. Ipak, debata je razjasnila par stvari koje su značajne za interpretaciju i dalju artikulaciju projekta.

Kao prvo, već na samom početku, dovedena je u pitanje osnovna ideja ovog istraživačkog projekta, kao i sam pristup istraživača. Pošto sam lokalac, od intervjuisanih sam očekivao određenu suzdržanost, čak i neprijateljski stav prema još jednom istraživanju lokalne NVO scene koje bi lako moglo da se shvati kao uobičajno kvantitativno istraživanje koje zapravo meri „kapacitete“ i „performanse“ NVO-a, namenjeno evaluaciji i dociplinovanju, postizanju veće „transparentnosti“ i „održivosti“. Zato je debata o „uzorku“ i načinu na koji je odabran, o metodologiji polustrukturiranih intervjuva i drugim pristupima kvalitativnom istraživanju, kao i konceptu zajedničkog istraživanja, od pomoći za ponovno promišljanje i unapređenje projekta.

Kao drugo, s postepenim razvojem projekta i prelaskom na sam proces istraživanja, ključna odrednica istraživanja je počela da dobija svoj konačni obris – pitanje krize. Debata je potvrdila da postoje raznovrsna shvatanja tekuće krize, kao i različita gledišta na to šta je tačno čini i kako ona utiče na NVO scenu u umetnosti i kulturi. Pitanje koje je iznova iskrsavalo je bilo: „Koja kriza?“ – tokom poslednjih par decenija smo bili izloženi različitim vrstama kriza: ekonomskim, humanitarnim, fiskalnim, itd. – i to pitanje implicira da mora postojati veća svest o mehanizmima krize kao glavnom oružju neoliberalne hegemonije.

I was a bit skeptical about a public discussion of the research project immediately after finishing up 15 interviews in 10 days. However, the discussion clarified a couple of important points for interpreting and further articulating the project.

Firstly, already at the beginning the overall idea of this research project – as well as its approach – was put into question. Being a local, I was expecting on the part of interviewees certain reluctance, even hostility, towards yet another research of the local NGO scene that could easily be taken as the usual quantitative research that is actually measuring “capacities” and “performance” of NGOs thus evaluating and disciplining them to be “transparent” and more “sustainable”. So, the discussion about the “sample” and how it was selected, the methodology of semi-structured interviews and other qualitative research approaches as well as the conception of co-research is helpful for rethinking and advancing the project.

Secondly, as we gradually developed the project and entered the research process itself, the key point of the research was starting to take a definite shape – that is the issue of crisis. The discussion confirmed that there are multifarious understandings of the on-going crisis, but also different views of what it exactly comprises and how does it bear on art-and-culture NGO scene. The reoccurring question: “What crisis?” – during the last couple of decades we were exposed to different kinds of crises: economic, humanitarian, fiscal, etc. – implied that there has to be more awareness of the mechanism of crisis as the main weapon of neo-liberal hegemony.

VAŽNOST ISTRAŽIVAČKIH PODUHVATA U POLJU DJELOVANJA NEVLADINIH ORGANIZACIJA U KULTURI

Većina rasprava o položaju i uvjetima rada nevladinih i neprofitnih organizacija koje djeluju u kulturi u post-jugoslavenskim zemljama suočava se s nedostatkom podataka koji se temelje na provedenim istraživanjima. Kulturni radnici i umjetnici koji djeluju u okviru civilnog društva tako su kontinuirano izloženi vođenju sličnih, a ponekad i istih rasprava, dakako s promjenom ključnih naglasaka ovisno o vremenu i mjestu u kojima se takve rasprave odvijaju. Izostanak interesa znanstvene zajednice te provoditelja i administratora kulturne politike za proučavanje ovog specifičnog polja naslanja se na sveukupni nedostatak interesa za provođenje istraživanja u području kulture i umjetnosti, nepostojanje sustavnih i kontinuiranih suradničkih poduhvata između ministarstava znanosti i ministarstava kulture te posljedično i kranje nedovoljnih izdvajanja sredstava u državnom proračunu za istraživanja u kulturi i umjetnosti. U takvim okolnostima izostanka sustavnih istraživačkih interesa i refleksije o ulozi, položaju, uvjetima proizvodnje, odnosima između različitih aktera u kulturnom sustavu, proizvodnju teorijskih promišljanja o različitim aspektima djelovanja organizacija civilnog društva u kulturi najčešće potpisuju upravo njihovi predstavnici. Uglavnom je riječ o diskurzivnoj reprezentaciji polja, njegovoj historijskoj retrospekciji te čitanju kulturnih praksi i njihovih uloga koje imaju u procesima društvenih preobrazbi. Na taj su način sami akteri nevladinih i neprofitnih organizacija doprinijeli teorijskoj artikulaciji pojedinih fenomena svoga djelovanja, nastojeći uz praktičan rad javnosti ponuditi i teorijska uporišta na koja se oslanjaju gradeći ovo kulturno polje.

Međutim, većina te diskurzivne proizvodnje nema u svojoj pozadini bazu podataka prikupljenih kroz raznolika empirijska istraživanja. Izostanak sustavnog istraživanja kulturnih i umjetničkih praksi izvan dominantnih matrica onemogućava kreiranje dugoročnih strategija djelovanja protagonista nevladinih organizacija u kulturi, otežava razumijevanje kompleksnosti ovog kulturnog polja, što u okviru kulturne politike dovodi do polarizacije cjelokupnog kulturnog polja koje se najčešće svodi na suprotstavljene pozicije između javnih kulturnih institucija i organizacija civilnog društva, a u novije vrijeme sve češće i na sukob s poduzetnički orijentiranim pothvatima koji su ključni nositelji kreativnih industrija.

Nedostatak podataka okupljenih na jednom mjestu, kao i izostanak kritičkih refleksija i teorijskih promišljanja i sustavnih analiza o afirmaciji neprofitnog i društveno angažiranog djelovanja, nasuprot dominaciji spektakla i tržišne orijentacije, predstavljaju svojevrsan problem i za svako buduće istraživanje te također, kako je već istaknuto, otežavaju aktualne rasprave unutar područja kulturne politike.

Rasprave su pritom dodatno otežane jer je riječ o vrlo dinamičnom i heterogenom polju koje je nemoguće jednoznačno odrediti, a njihovo je tumačenje i analizu neophodno temeljiti na sagledavanju društvenih, političkih, ekonomskih i kulturnih okolnosti u kojima se razvijaju. Suvremena kultura upregnuta je naime u aktualne ekonomske, političke i društvene procese, pa tako danas kulturu nije moguće razmatrati izvan tokova neoliberalnog kapitalizma i potrošačkog društva. Stoga je za razumijevanje ovih sveprisutnih veza potrebno detaljno preispitivati prilike i promjene na globalnoj sceni ekonomskih kretanja i njihov utjecaj na sve ostale segmente društva, ujedno i na kulturnu i umjetničku produkciju. Samim tim je za razumijevanje dinamike kulturnih odnosa i pozicije kultura izvan dominantne paradigme nepohodno analizirati njihovu svakodnevnu praksu stvaranja i odnosa te uvjete u kojima one nastaju. U cilju dobivanja uvida u procese formiranja mnogobrojnih i raznolikih organizacija civilnog društva koje djeluju u polju kulture i umjetnosti neophodno je istražiti okolnosti koje su otvorile nove pristupe u kulturi te načine na koje su se okolnosti mijenjale i dalje utjecale na razvoj i ulogu ovih kulturnih praksi u post-tranzicijskim društvima. Takav pristup će nam pokazati da nije riječ o izoliranom polju koje nastaje izvan glavnih povijesnih tokova i gibanja društva, već je u snažnoj i neprekinutoj interakciji sa svim aspektima suvremenog života.

S obzirom da suvremeni neoliberalni kapitalizam kulturni i umjetnički proizvod tretira kao predmet razmjene koji će omogućiti stjecanje profita, stvara se konzumeristička, potrošačka i masovna kultura koja uzurpira kulturu pretvarajući je u robu, a paralelno prijetoj opstanku onih umjetnika i kulturnih radnika koji se ne žele uključiti u dominantni model proizvodnje i potrošnje i koji ne žele prihvatiti zakonitosti funkcioniranja tržišta. U takvim okolnostima kultura kontinuirano gubi svoj raniji kritički potencijal te su potrebni uvijek novi zamašnjaci da se pruži otpor kakav se najvećim dijelom danas, u kontekstu postjugoslavenskih zemalja, stvara među organizacijama civilnog društva. Upravo one, svjesne takvih prigoda i mehanizama suvremenog društva, ne prihvaćaju strategiju zatečenog stanja, nego teže izgraditi kritički pristup prema sustavu unutar kojeg djeluju i nastoje ovladati sredstvima koja su im dostupna kako bi se oduprijeli dominantnoj matrici. Riječ je o kulturnim i umjetničkim praksama koje se najčešće rastvaraju u aktivnom sudjelovanju u

interpretaciji, revaloriziranju i odbijanju dominantnog i nametnutog kulturnog modela, a mnoge organizacije pokazuju ozbiljan potencijal za političku intervenciju primjenom novih mehanizama i modela djelovanja kojima reaguju na kontekst nastojeći na njega utjecati i time dekonstruirati neupitne službene autoritete. Tako se jedan dio umjetnika i kulturnih radnika koji djeluju u ovom polju, u trenutku kada im dostupna sredstva nisu dostatna, okreće i političkom djelovanju koje time postaje integralni dio njihovog umjetničkog rada i kulturnog javnog djelovanja. Upravo oni zahtijevaju reviziju institucionalne i administrativne podloge na kojoj se temelji umjetnički i kulturni život čime svoju aktivnost s umjetničkog i kulturnog prenose na političko područje. Izazivajući sustav i stvarajući uvjete za komunikaciju – sukobljavanje i suprotstavljanje, pregovaranje i dijalogiziranje – oni postaju aktivni sudionici društvenih i političkih zbivanja. Međutim, bilo bi poželjno da takve ambicije i poduhvati u svojoj podlozi imaju istraživački pristup koji bi ih opremio čvrstom analitičkom podlogom i osigurao vođenje argumentirane rasprave i zagovaračkih procesa u kojima nije moguće osporiti iznesene činjenice.

Kao što je već istaknuto ovo heterogeno kulturno polje nije moguće svesti na žanrovsku praksu ili jedno područje, pa je neophodno istražiti njegovu raznolikost, dodire, sličnosti i razlike. Istraživačkim poduhvatima mogu biti ispitani pojmovi kao što su fleksibilnost, hibridnost, umreženost, dinamičnost i interaktivnost. S obzirom na to da su ovi pojmovi različiti od onih koje još uvijek u većini slučajeva vezujemo za javne kulturne ustanove, a među kojima su primjerice statičnost, homogenost, izoliranost i pasivnost, istraživanjima je moguće dodatno proniknuti u dubinske strukture i izgrađena značenja koja se uspostavljaju na binarnom razlikovanju kulturnih elemenata, primarno u međuodnosu između javnih kulturnih institucija i nevladinih organizacija. Također je potrebno podacima potkrijepiti evidentnu činjenicu da se suvremeni društveni tokovi i pozornica "nematerijalnog rada", na kojoj se gube granice između nekada razdijeljenih sfera radnog i slobodnog vremena, u svojoj izrazito negativnoj pojavnosti upravo vezuju uz uvjete rada umjetnika, teoretičara, kritičara, kustosa i kulturnih radnika koji stvaraju označiteljske prakse i svijet kulturnog polja nevladinih organizacija. Samozaposleni radnici i umjetnici najčešće se tako dovode u vezu s nekom od sljedećih karakteristika: privremenost, prolaznost, nesigurnost, fleksibilnost, mobilnost, umreženost, suradnja, dinamičnost, efektivnost... Pritom većina nabrojanih karakteristika sadržava u sebi i pozitivne i negativne aspekte suvremenog "nematerijalnog rada" koje je potrebno detaljno rasvijetliti u cilju razumijevanja prirode i karaktera kulturnih i umjetničkih radnika koji djeluju u okviru nevladinih i neprofitnih organizacija u kontekstu postjugoslavenskih zemalja.

Iako je ovdje ponuđen vrlo kratak pregled nekih od ključnih pitanja vezanih za karakteristike i uvjete rada nevladinih i neprofitnih organizacija u kulturi koje djeluju na području nekadašnjih jugoslavenskih republika, čini se da upravo ona mogu biti neka od primarnih pitanja na koja bi buduća istraživanja, pa tako i ovo poduzeto u okviru programa "Raskršća Istok Zapad" i projekta "Mašinsko odeljenje Evropa", mogla dati odgovore potkrijepljene podacima i primjerima. Već i ovi uvidi pokazuju da suvremena kulturna praksa nudi niz različitih situacija, pa je pokušaj stvaranja statičnih općih uvida zamka koju svakako treba nastojati izbjeći. Dakako, neophodno je u istraživačkim poduhvatima iznaći one primjere i slučajeve koji potkrepljuju iznesene teze, a moguća područja analize i istraživanja mogu se odnositi na analizu političke organizacije kulture, razmatranje okolnosti koje su dovele do formiranja ovog specifičnog kulturnog polja i njegovog antagoniziranja prema dominantnoj kulturi te dati odgovore na neka od sljedećih pitanja: zašto je službene matrice i dalje najčešće isključuju, iz kojih je razloga marginalizirana, tko je degradira i negira unatoč činjenici da je riječ o kulturi koja publiku drži u stalnom doticaju sa suvremenim kulturnim i umjetničkim istraživačkim i progresivnim praksama, što je dosada učinjeno u istraživanju ovih praksi, kakvi su materijalni uvjeti rada protagonista, na koji način i u kojoj mjeri se postojeće društvene nejednakosti odražavaju i transferiraju u područje kulture itd. Vodeći računa i o raznolikosti ovog polja, istraživanja je moguće usmjeriti primarno prema onim samoorganiziranim kolektivima kojima ključno polazište nije isključivo umjetnička estetika i izvrsnost, već duboka uronjenost u vlastitu sredinu i nastojanje da se pažljivo motre njene koordinate političkih, ekonomskih, društvenih i kulturnih stremljenja. Koji će od navedenih područja interesa prevladati, što će biti predmet istraživanja, na koji će način biti formulirano istraživačko pitanje, kao i odabir metodologije, ovisi o interesima samih istraživača. A s obzirom na evidentan nedostatak istraživanja, čini se da je važno podržati čak i ona istraživanja koja nisu dokraja jasno definirana i koja nemaju unaprijed zadana usmjerenja već su temeljena na eksperimentalnom i otvorenom pristupu. Takva istraživanja, koja dopuštaju biti vođena podacima, mogu biti posebno važna u ovom fluidnom polju čije je aktere teško jasno locirati u tradicionalnim društvenim kategorijama i umjetničkim disciplinama.

Dea Vidović

THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH PROJECTS IN THE FIELD OF NGO CULTURAL ACTIVITY

Most discussions regarding the position and the working conditions of non-governmental and non-profit organizations in post-Yugoslav countries suffer from a shortage of research-derived data. Cultural workers and artist that are active in civil society are thus continually exposed to similar, and sometimes repeated discussions, albeit with shifting focal points, depending on the time and place of the discussion. The lack of interest for studying this specific field - both by the scientific community as well as various actors and administrators of cultural policy - stems from the overall lack of interest for conducting research in the areas of culture and art, the non-existence of systematic and continuous cooperative cultural projects between ministries of science and ministries of culture, and consequently, grossly insufficient funds allocated for culture and art research in the state budget. In such circumstances, void of any interest for systematic research or reflection about the role, position, conditions of production or relations between various actors in the cultural system, production of theoretical thinking about various aspects of the activities undertaken by civil society organizations is in most cases consigned to those that represent them. The results largely amount to a discursive representation of various fields, historical retrospectives and readings of cultural practices and the roles they play in the processes of social change. In that way, the very actors of non-governmental and non-profit organizations contribute to theoretical articulation of certain phenomena in regard to their activity, endeavoring to offer to the public theoretical grounds for developing this cultural field, alongside their practical work.

However, most of this discourse production is not backed by data gathered through varied empirical research. The lack of systematic research of cultural and art practices outside of the dominant matrix inhibits the creation of long-term strategies for the activities of non-governmental organization in culture and makes it harder to understand the complexity of this cultural field, which leads to a polarization of the entire cultural field in terms of cultural policy, which in itself can, in most cases, be boiled down to opposing positions taken by public cultural institutions and civil society organizations, and lately and more frequently, to confrontation with entrepreneurially-minded projects, which have

become indispensable for keeping the creative industry going. The lack of organized and centrally-available data, as well as a lack of critical reflection, theoretical thinking and systematic analysis regarding the affirmation of not-for-profit, socially engaged activity, as opposed to the dominant spectacle and market-orientation, presents future researchers with a unique problem, while also hindering any discussion in the field of cultural policy today.

An additional hindrance in that respect is the fact that such discussions take place in a vigorous, dynamic and heterogeneous field, which is impossible to define unambiguously, while their interpretation and analysis must take into account the social, political, economic and cultural circumstances in which they develop. Current culture is reined into contemporary economic, political and social processes; it is impossible to consider culture today outside of the dynamics of neoliberal capitalism and the consumer society. Therefore, understanding these all-permeating connections requires a detailed re-examination of the situation, of the ongoing changes in the global economy and their influence on all other segments of society, including cultural and artistic production. Consequently, if we desire to understand the dynamics of cultural relationships and the position of those cultures that are outside of the dominant paradigm, we inevitably must analyze their day-to-day practice of creation and their mutual relationships, as well as the conditions that give rise to them. In order to gain insight into the processes of formation of various civil society organizations that are active in the field of culture and art, it is necessary to examine the circumstances that have opened up new approaches to culture as well as the ways in which these circumstances have changed and further influenced the development and role of these cultural practices in post-transitional societies. Such an approach will show that this is not an isolated field that emerges outside of the main flow of history, but rather a strong and continuous interaction with all aspects of contemporary life.

Considering that modern neoliberal capitalism treats the cultural and art product as an object of trade that allows for profit to be made, a consumerist mass culture is created, one that usurps culture and commodifies it, while simultaneously threatening the very survival of those artist and cultural workers that do not wish to be included in the dominant model of production and consumption, those who refuse to abide by the laws of the market. In these sorts of circumstances, culture continuously loses its earlier critical potential and new initiators are always needed in order to create resistance in the manner in which civil society organizations are resisting today, in the context of post-Yugoslav countries.

It is these very organizations, being aware of the situation and the mechanisms of modern society, that do not accept the strategy of "working within existing conditions"; but strive to build a critical view of the system in which they are active, as well as to master those means of resisting the dominant matrix that are at their disposal. These are cultural and artistic practices that are most often diluted by active participation in interpretation, reevaluation and refusal of the dominant imposed cultural model, while many organizations display great potential for political intervention through applying new mechanisms and models of actions or reactions to the context, striving to influence it and thus deconstruct the unquestionable official authority. In this way, when available resources become insufficient, some artists and cultural workers that are active in this field turn to political activism, which becomes an integral part of their artistic work or public appearance. It is they that demand a revision of institutional and administrative background upon which artistic and cultural life is based, therefore transferring their activity from the area of art and culture to politics. By challenging the system and creating conditions for communication – conflict and confrontation, negotiation and dialogue – they become active participants in social and political events. However, it is highly desirable that such ambitions and undertakings be based upon research, which would equip those actors with a solid analytical background, ensuring a discussion based on arguments and the sort of advocacy that does not leave room for disputing the stated facts.

As was previously outlined, this heterogeneous cultural field is not reducible to some kind of genre practice or a single area. Therefore it is necessary to explore its diversity, the ways in which it touches upon other fields, their similarities and differences. Research projects can examine notions such as flexibility, hybridity, networking, dynamism and interactivity. Considering that these notions are different from those that we still largely continue to associate with public cultural institutions – for example, static, homogeneity, isolation and passivity – research can penetrate further into the deep structures and developed meanings that establish themselves upon the binary distinction of cultural elements, primarily in interrelation between public cultural institutions and non-governmental organizations. Data is also necessary to back the evident fact that modern social currents and the stage of "immaterial work", where boundaries between once separate spheres of work time and free time are disappearing, in their extremely negative manifestation are precisely connected to the working conditions of artists, theorists, critics, curators and cultural workers that create signifying practices and the very world of the cultural field of non-governmental organizations.

Self-employed workers and artist are often associated with one of the

following characteristics: temporary, ephemeral, uncertain, flexible, mobile, networked, in cooperation, dynamism, effective... Also, most of these characteristics contain both positive and negative aspects of contemporary "immaterial work" which need to be discussed and revealed in detail in order to understand the nature and character of cultural and artistic workers who are active through non-governmental and non-profit organizations in the context of post-Yugoslav countries.

Although this is a very short review of non-governmental and non-profit organization in culture active in ex-Yugoslav countries, it would seem that these are the very questions that could be of prime interest for some future research, including this one, undertaken as a part of the "Crossroads East West" and "Engine Room Europe" projects, so that they could give answers backed by data and examples. These insights are enough to show that modern cultural practice presents a series of different situations, so that any attempt to create some static, universal insight is revealed as a trap to be avoided at all cost. Of course, research projects must unearth examples and cases that support their thesis, and the possible areas of analysis and examination can include political organization of culture, consideration of circumstances that lead to the formation of this specific cultural field and its antagonism towards the dominant culture; but they can also answer the following questions: why do official patterns still frequently exclude it, what are the reasons for its marginalization, who is degrading it and negating it in spite of the fact that it is a culture that keeps the audience in constant touch with contemporary cultural and artistic research and progressive practices, what has so far been done to examine these practices, what are the material working conditions of its protagonists, in what way and to what extent are existing societal inequalities being upheld and transferred into the area of culture etc. Taking into account the diversity of this field, it is possible to point the research primarily towards those self-organized collectives whose key starting points are not limited to artistic aesthetics and excellence, but also include a deep immersion into their local environment and an effort to closely monitor the coordinates of its political, economic, social and cultural tendencies. Which one of these areas of interest will prevail, what will be the subject of discussion, in what way will the research questions be formulated and what methodology will be chosen – that depends upon the interests of researchers. But taking into account the evident lack of research, it would seem tremendously important to support even research that has not been thoroughly defined and which lacks a predetermined direction, but that is based upon an experimental and open approach. Such research, which allows itself to be led by data, can be of special significance in this fluid field, whose actors it is difficult to clearly place in traditional social categories and artistic disciplines.

Monika Mokre

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE ADVANTAGES AND POSSIBLE PITFALLS OF CO-RESEARCH

By chance, respectively due to the fact that I am very late in delivering this essay, I have started to write it at the time of a conference on cultural management. The topic of one of the sessions was the constructive and destructive impact of Western funding in African contexts. The South African cultural worker and manager introducing this topic described in the first part of his intervention the difficulties African cultural initiatives funded by European organizations or institutions face: shrinking funds, no funding of infrastructure, changing aims and goals of the funders, lack of sustainability.

I mention this experience at the beginning of this paper as these problems are very similar to those described in interviews with Serbian cultural initiatives carried out in the project Engine Room Europe. Furthermore, these problems are very similar to those we know from cultural work in Western and Northern Europe.

Is thus all the same in the sector of smaller cultural initiatives, irrespectively of their geographical position which includes a specific position in the global economic and political system? Quite obviously not – still, problems and developments are perceived of in a very similar way. And, of course, these similarities in perception point towards similarities in structures and dynamics all over the world, such as shrinking public funds.

However, we all know that there are also radical structural differences between the situations of cultural workers in different parts of the world. Many of those differences are due to global power and market relations, i.e. due to global exploitation structures. As is commonly known, these exploitation structures frequently remain invisible, and this enhances their stability.

The presented project within the frame of Engine Room Europe was methodologically based on co-research. The relationship between actors and researchers was understood as one of sympathy and solidarity and the focus of the project was on the experiences of the interviewed actors. Experience was here understood as going through something and

making sense of what one is going through. This form of reflection is understood as a form of politicization. And the concrete problems which were experienced and then reflected as experiences would lead to a more general understanding of a problematic.

This framework was developed in juxtaposition to mainstream academic research where the researcher as an assumed objective observer defines the problematic before starting the research and understands the actors in the field as mere objects of his/her research. Co-research acknowledges the priority of the experiences of the actors as well as their ability to self-reflection. Co-research also problematizes implicitly and explicitly the role of the researcher, respectively the outside observer. In this project of Engine Room Europe, in fact, only one researcher came from the "outside", one of them was himself a Serbian cultural worker.

This approach is of paramount hermeneutic as well as political impact. Power relations between "researchers" and "researched" are deconstructed and the results of the process are much more open than in the case of more traditional research methods. However, as every method also co-research poses academic and political problems which should be laid open in order to assess its possibilities and limits.

First, the question arises what an experience is. In the understanding of the researchers, an experience consists of something one has lived through and the reflection on this event. It is important to consider both parts of this definition as this implies, among other things, that the same events can lead to quite different experiences depending on the way in which the events are reflected. However, this does not mean that reflection is an individual activity. For one, we frequently reflect collectively and frame events in a common way. Secondly, and probably more importantly, the ways in which we reflect events depend on hegemonic discourses. To use an example of my own research: Ten years ago, nobody I knew in Austria defined him/herself as part of the creative industries. People were designers, applied artists, game developers etc. – nowadays, they work in the creative industries. The creative industries were discursively constructed and hyped as part of a specific political agenda – and, at one point in time this hype reached the pre-defined actors within the creative industries and shaped their modes of self-reflection.

Another example is the notion of precariousness. This concept comes out of a counter-hegemonic, critical discourse that has become very effective in specific societal fields and has, again, entered the self-descriptions of actors, respectively their reflections of their life situation.

Obviously, this is not just a question of wording – or, to put it in another

way, wording is shaping our thought, our reflections, and, thus, our experiences. When co-research means to go from the problem to the problematic, we have to keep in mind that the problem is also shaped by the problematic. Subjective experience (be it individual or collective) is always already part of hegemonic discourse. It expresses itself within the framework of hegemonic discourse, in the words of hegemonic discourse, and it tends to overlook or exclude the elements invisible in hegemonic discourse.

As the two examples above have shown, there are several hegemonic discourses available in society. To put in a very simplified way: there are mainstream hegemonic discourses but also hegemonic discourses of specific scenes or of counter publics. Thus, the inscription of one's experience into a hegemonic discourse can have an emancipatory character, it can lead to collective action and solidarity.

However, I would argue that this way of dealing with one's experiences does not need a co-research project. In this case, politicization comes out of interpreting one's own perceptions within the framework of an emancipatory discourse. If co-research is meant to contribute to politicization and if it should also be understood as a form of experimentation, it has to construct a new discourse. Probably, this discourse develops out of the interaction between (1) cultural workers and researchers, and (2) between "inside" and "outside". This brings up the question for the role of the researchers.

Obviously, the two researchers played two different roles. For one, there was the external researcher.

By being external, she brought a different perspective to the experiences of the actors. But what exactly did that mean – not in general but for the concrete project at hand? It seems to me that with regard to the respective roles of external researcher and cultural workers three claims were made here: (1) researcher and actors share a common understanding, (2) the experiences of the actors are prioritized, (3) the researcher provides a new perspective from the outside. If this description is accurate, there is a certain tension between these three parts, e.g. it could well be that the ability to bring up new perspectives is limited by the common background and understanding of researchers and actors. Secondly, and related to this, there seems to be a certain danger that the blind spots of the actors are the same ones as those of the researcher so that things made invisible in discourse remain invisible.

This probably holds even truer for the "internal" researcher. It has not become clear to me how his role was defined – as a mediator between

actors and external researcher (is such a person really needed?), as a self-reflective actor (but according to the principles of the project all actors are self-reflective).

Obviously, these remarks are not meant to question the individual contributions of the two researchers to the project. They are positioned on a structural level. And with regard to this structural level, I would claim that during the whole process of co-research all participants have to reflect their position in this process and the differences and similarities of their experiences. Differently from mainstream research, not only the experiences of the researched but also the experiences of the researcher have to form part of the communication process. Thereby, I would think it productive if the researcher made a conscious effort to take one step back from the experiences of the actors, i.e. rather to focus on differences of experiences than on similarities in order to develop new perspectives which could eventually lead to a new discourse.

I think, however, that, for such a new discourse to emerge, one has to get beyond (or below) the level of experiences towards a more analytical understanding of what has been experienced including structures, dynamics, and contexts influencing these experiences. To put it in a different way: Theoretical approaches are needed to enable some further perspectives on the problems at hand. Given the background of both actors and researchers in the discussed project it is quite clear that their reflection and self-reflection are heavily influenced by political and arts theory. Still, I think that a more systematic theoretical approach is necessary to exploit all possibilities of co-research.

Let us now look more concretely at the project of research within the Engine Room Europe. The overall theme of the project was "crisis". While this term is ambiguous and, thus, opens up a lot of space for different interpretations and associations, it seems interesting to me that a co-research project would start up with a theme. I rather would have expected a radical bottom-up approach, asking actors for their experiences and problems and developing a kind of framework of these experiences afterwards.

In fact, this is not meant as a critique of the project as I think that the – controversial – notion of crisis has, indeed, shed a new perspective on the problems actors have been facing and has provoked some interesting answers. However, I am wondering if the role and impact of the researchers in the project is not rather played down when the general lens on the situation of the actors is predefined by the researchers. And it could also be that a focus on the clearly hegemonic notion of crisis makes

it more difficult to develop a new, counter-hegemonic discourse.

However, in spite of the fact that crisis is a global phenomenon or, at least, a global form to address contemporary problems, some answers of the initiatives were quite clearly shaped by the specific situation in Serbia, e.g. the question for new relations with the working class or also the claim for a renewal of left language seem to mirror the history of Yugoslavia. The aim to connect with Serbian emigrant initiatives, on the other hand, clearly mirrors the contemporary situation of Serbia as an emigration country.

Many other open questions deal with problems shared by many emancipatory initiatives all over the world and, in my understanding it would make sense to look at these problems simultaneously, i.e. to strive for transnational comparisons. The project in Serbia could serve as a starting point for such an endeavor providing questions and answers that could be discussed with emancipatory initiatives in other countries.

Summarizing, I would, thus think that this research within the Engine Room Europe is a promising starting point for (1) a form of research adequate to politically emancipatory projects, and (2) a deconstructive critique of mainstream academic work and thought. In order to fully exploit its possibilities I would hope for its further development in a theory-driven as well as comparative analytical form.

Monika Mokre

NEKA RAZMIŠLJANJA O PREDNOSTIMA I MOGUĆIM ZAMKAMA ZAJEDNIČKOG ISTRAŽIVANJA

Igrom slučaja, pre svega zahvaljujući činjenici da sam prilično okasnila sa ovim esejem, započela sam da ga pišem za vreme jedne konferencije o menadžmentu u kulturi. Tema jedne od sesija je bio konstruktivni i destruktivni uticaj zapadnjačkog finansiranja u afričkim kontekstima. Temu je pokrenuo kulturni delatnik i menadžer iz Južnoafričke republike, opisavši u svom uvodnom izlaganju poteškoće s kojima se susreću afričke kulturne inicijative finansirane od strane evropskih organizacija i institucija: sve manje budžete, nedostatak finansijskih sredstava za infrastrukturu, promenljivost namera i ciljeva finansijera, manjak održivosti.

Pominjem ovo iskustvo na početku teksta zbog toga što su ovi problemi izuzetno slični problemima opisanim u razgovorima sa kulturnim inicijativama u Srbiji obavljenim u okviru projekta Mašinsko odeljenje Evropa (Engine Room Europe). Štaviše, ti problemi su veoma slični onima koje poznajemo iz rada u kulturi u Zapadnoj i Severnoj Evropi.

Da li bi se moglo reći da je situacija istovetna svuda u sektoru manjih kulturnih inicijativa, bez obzira na njihov geografski položaj koji podrazumeva i položaj u globalnom ekonomskom i političkom sistemu? Očigledno je da to nije slučaj – ali ipak, problemi i događanja se percipiraju na veoma sličan način. I, naravno, ove sličnosti u percepciji ukazuju na sličnosti u strukturama i dinamici širom sveta, kao što je, na primer, sve manji obim javnih fondova.

Ipak, svima nama je jasno da postoje i radikalne razlike u strukturi situacija u kojima se nalaze kulturni radnici iz različitih krajeva sveta. Mnoge od ovih razlika su izazvane globalnim odnosima moći i tržišta, tj. globalnim strukturama eksploatacije. Kao što je opšte poznato, ove strukture eksploatacije su često nevidljive, što ojačava njihovu stabilnost.

Predstavljeni projekat u okviru Engine Room Europe je metodološki zasnovan na zajedničkom istraživanju. Odnos između anketiranih i istraživača je shvaćen kao odnos saosećanja i solidarnosti, a fokus projekta je bio na iskustvima intervjuisanih delatnika. Iskustvo je u ovom slučaju shvaćeno kao prolaženje kroz doživljaje i razumevanje toga kroz šta se

prolazi. Ovaj vid refleksije je shvaćen kao vid politizacije, a konkretni problemi koje su intervjuisani iskusili i koje su promišljali kao iskustva trebalo je da dovedu do opštijeg razumevanja problematike.

Ovakav okvir za istraživanje je postavljen kao antipod „mejnstrim” akademskom istraživanju, u kojem istraživač definiše problematiku pre početka istraživanja i posmatra delatnike kao objekte istraživanja, kao svojevrsan, pretpostavlja se, objektivni posmatrač. Zajedničko istraživanje priznaje prioritet iskustvima delatnika, kao i njihovoj sposobnosti za auto-refleksiju. Zajedničko istraživanje takođe, implicitno i eksplicitno, problematizuje ulogu istraživača odnosno eksternog posmatrača. U projektu Engine Room Europe je zapravo samo jedan istraživač dolazio „spolja”, dok je drugi i sam bio radnik u kulturi u Srbiji.

Ovakav pristup je od prvorazrednog hermeneutičkog, kao i političkog značaja. Odnosi moći između „istraživača” i „istražvanih” se na taj način dekonstruišu i rezultati procesa su mnogo otvoreniji nego u slučaju tradicionalnih istraživačkih metoda. Ipak, kao i svaka metoda, zajedničko istraživanje se susreće sa naučnim i političkim problemima koje je potrebno preispitati da bi se pravilno procenile njegove mogućnosti i ograničenja.

Kao prvo, postavlja se pitanje toga šta je iskustvo. Prema shvatanju istraživača, iskustvo se sastoji od onoga što je čovek proživio koliko i od razmatranja tog događaja. Važno je razmotriti oba dela ove definicije, pošto se tu, između ostalog, implicira da isti događaji mogu dovesti do prilično različitih iskustava u zavisnosti od toga na koji se način razmatraju. Međutim, to ne znači da je razmatranje individualna aktivnost. Kao prvo, događaje često zajednički razmatramo i smeštamo ih u neki uobičajeni okvir. Kao drugo, i verovatno važnije, načini na koje ih razmatramo zavise od hegemonih diskursa. Pozvaću se na primer iz sopstvenog istraživanja: pre deset godina, niko koga sam poznavala u Austriji nije sebe definisao kao deo „kreativnih industrija”. Ljudi su bili dizajneri, primenjeni umetnici, developeri video igara itd. – dok danas svi rade u kreativnim industrijama. Kreativne industrije su konstruisane kroz diskurs i hajpovane kao deo određene političke agende – i, u jednom trenutku, ovaj hajp je stigao do prethodno definisanih delatnika unutar kreativne industrije i oblikovao njihove moduse samorazumevanja.

Još jedan primer je pojam prekarnosti. Ovaj koncept potiče iz kontrahegemonog kritičkog diskursa koji je postao izuzetno uticajan u određenim društvenim poljima i koji je takođe našao svoje mesto u načinu na koji delatnici sebe opisuju, odnosno u njihovom razumevanju sopstvene životne situacije.

Naravno, ovo nije samo pitanje načina izražavanja – ili, drugim rečima, način izražavanja oblikuje naše misli, naša razmatranja, pa tako i naša iskustva. Kada zajedničko istraživanje pokušava da se sa problema pomeri ka problematici, moramo imati na umu da je baš „problematika“ ono što oblikuje sam problem. Subjektivno iskustvo (bilo lično ili kolektivno) je uvek deo hegemonog diskursa. Izražava se u okviru hegemonog diskursa, rečima hegemonog diskursa i ima tendenciju da previdi ili isključi elemente koji su nevidljivi u hegemonom diskursu.

Kao što ovi gorenavedeni primeri pokazuju, u društvu postoji nekoliko hegemonih diskursa. Da to kažemo krajnje jednostavno: postoje mejnstrim hegemoni diskursi, ali postoje i hegemoni diskursi određenih scena ili kontrajavnosti. Stoga, upisivanje iskustva pojedinca u hegemoni diskurs može da ima emancipatorski karakter - može voditi ka kolektivnoj akciji i solidarnosti.

Međutim, rekla bih da ovaj način bavljenja sopstvenim iskustvima ne zahteva projekat zajedničkog istraživanja. U ovom slučaju, politizacija potiče iz interpretacije sopstvene percepcije unutar okvira jednog emancipatorskog diskursa. Ako je zajedničko istraživanje namenjeno tome da doprinese politizaciji i ako ga takođe razumemo kao oblik eksperimentisanja, ono bi trebalo da konstruiše novi diskurs. Verovatno se taj diskurs razvija iz interakcije između (1) kulturnih radnika i istraživača, i (2) između „unutrašnjosti“ i „spoljašnjosti“. Ovo nas dovodi do pitanja uloge istraživača.

Očigledno je da su dva istraživača igrala dve različite uloge. Kao prvo, postojao je eksterni istraživač. Istraživač sa eksterne pozicije donosi drugačije gledište na iskustva delatnika. Ali šta je to tačno značilo – ne u opštem smislu, već za konkretan projekat? Meni se čini da su po pitanju uloga eksternog istraživača i kulturnih radnika postavljene tri tvrdnje: (1) istraživači i delatnici dele određene stavove, (2) prioritet imaju iskustva delatnika, (3) istraživač pruža novo gledište, spolja. Ako je ovaj opis tačan, postoji određena napetost između ove tri teze, npr. moglo bi se reći da je sposobnost uvođenja novih gledišta ograničena baš činjenicom da i istraživač i istraživani dolaze iz iste sfere delatnosti i dele određene stavove. Nadalje, i u vezi s tim, čini se da postoji određena opasnost da su slepe mrlje u percepciji delatnika iste one koje postoje kod istraživača, zbog čega ostaju nevidljive sve stvari koje su i inače nevidljive u diskursu.

Ovo je verovatno još istinitije kada je reč o „internom“ istraživaču. Meni i dalje nije jasno kako je tačno ova uloga definisana – kao medijatora između delatnika i eksternog istraživača (pod uslovom da je takva osoba uopšte potrebna?) ili kao samopromišljajućeg delatnika (ali, prema

principima projekta, samopromišljanje se očekuje od svih delatnika)?

Naravno, ove primedbe nemaju za cilj da dovedu u pitanje individualne doprinose dva istraživača projektu. One su usmerene na strukturalni nivo. A kada je reč o strukturalnom nivou, rekla bih da tokom čitavog procesa zajedničkog istraživanja, svi učesnici moraju da promišljaju svoju poziciju u procesu, kao i razlike i sličnosti u njihovim iskustvima. Za razliku od mejnstrim istraživanja, činilac procesa komunikacije moraju da budu ne samo iskustva onih koji su „istraživani“, već i iskustva samog istraživača. Stoga bih istraživanje smatrala produktivnim u slučaju da istraživač učini svestan napor da se distancira od iskustava delatnika, tj. da se usredsredi na različitost iskustava umesto na sličnosti među njima, kako bi otvorio nova gledišta koja bi tako mogla dovesti do novog diskursa.

Ipak, rekla bih da je za pojavu takvog novog diskursa potrebno otići dalje od (ili ispod) nivoa iskustava, ka jednom izraženije analitičkom razumevanju doživljenih iskustava, uključujući tu i strukture, dinamike i kontekste koji utiču na ta iskustva. Drugim rečima: neophodni su teorijski pristupi koji će omogućiti daljna gledišta na probleme pred nama. S obzirom na polazišta delatnika i istraživača u projektu o kome je reč, potpuno je jasno da su njihova razmatranja i auto-refleksija u velikoj meri pod uticajem političke teorije i teorije umetnosti. I pored toga smatram da je neophodan sistematizovaniji teoretski pristup, kako bi se iskoristile sve mogućnosti koje zajedničko istraživanje nudi.

Pogledajmo sada malo konkretnije sam projekat istraživanja unutar Engine Room Europe. Opšta tema projekta je bila „kriza“. Iako je ovaj pojam višeznačan i zato otvara dosta prostora za različite interpretacije i asocijacije, meni se čini interesantnim to da je projektu zajedničkog istraživanja data tema. Pre bih očekivala radikalan pristup „odozdo nagore“, u kome se delatnicima postavljaju pitanja o njihovim iskustvima i problemima nakon čega se razvija neka vrsta okvira za ova iskustva.

U stvari, ovo nije zamišljeno kao kritika projekta, pošto je moje mišljenje da je taj kontroverzni pojam krize zapravo sa novog gledišta osvetlio probleme s kojima su se suočavali delatnici, kao i da je podstakao da se daju određeni interesantni odgovori. Ipak, pitam se da li su uloga i uticaj istraživača na projektu na neki način podcenjeni, kada sami istraživači unapred definišu ugao gledanja na situaciju u kojoj se delatnici nalaze. A moglo bi biti i to da fokusiranje na očigledno hegemoni pojam krize otežava razvoj novog, kontra-hegemonog diskursa.

Međutim, uprkos činjenici da je kriza globalni fenomen ili makar globalni oblik adresiranja savremenih problema, odgovori određenih inicijativa su krajnje očigledno oblikovani specifičnom situacijom u Srbiji, npr. pitanje

novih odnosa sa radničkom klasom ili zahtevi za obnovu jezika levice, i ti odgovori kao da u ogledalu prikazuju istoriju Jugoslavije. Povezivanje sa inicijativama srpskih emigranata, s druge strane, jasno odražava stanje savremene Srbije kao zemlje emigracije.

Mnoga druga otvorena pitanja se bave problemima koje dele mnogobrojne emancipatorske inicijative širom sveta i, prema mom mišljenju, bilo bi razumno da se ovi problemi posmatraju istovremeno tj. da se teži transnacionalnim poređenjima. Projekat u Srbiji bi mogao da posluži kao početna tačka za takav poduhvat, donoseći pitanja i odgovore o kojima se može diskutovati sa emancipatorskim inicijativama u drugim zemljama.

Da rezimiram: smatram da je ovo istraživanje u okviru Engine Room Europe obećavajuće polazište za (1) oblikovanje istraživanja koje je prikladno projektima političke emancipacije, i (2) dekonstruktivnu kritiku mejnstrim akademskog rada i mišljenja. Kako bi se do kraja iskoristile njegove mogućnosti, nadam se da će se dalje razvijati u jednu teorijom vođenu i komparativno-analitičku formu.

Emil Majuk

WAY TO THE FUTURE - CIVIL SOCIETY AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS IN POLAND

Results of the activity of many NGOs show that during a crisis of politics, understood in a traditional way, it is the civil society that answers contemporary challenges more effectively than most governmental and local institutions. In last weeks the Maidan in Kiev, a victory of a self-organized group of people over the authoritarian regime of Victor Yanukovych, proved to be an emphatic example of the strength of civil society.

In the words of professor Janusz Czapiński, who has for a long time been the manager of a Polish national survey named „Social Diagnosis”, active citizenship, which still a rare thing in Poland, civil society, which has not yet been achieved even 21 years after the fall of Communism, as well as that which is broadly defined as social capital, are now the biggest challenges standing in front our country. It is this capital that will determine whether we go any further, or halt our progress. Meeting with representatives of non-governmental organizations in Serbia has confirmed my conviction that there exists a great slumbering potential for social organization. It showed also that both the strong points of Serbian organizations and the problems that they struggle with are similar to the challenges faced by Polish organizations.

NGOs share the following characteristics: innovation, creativity, flexibility in operation, commitment and the willingness of people working in these organizations to make sacrifices, the ability to identify social needs and problems (especially socially difficult and sensitive issues), the ability to find a solution to these types of issues through close contact with the people affected by the problem (e.g. the homeless, the sick, the marginalized, etc.), relatively low operating costs (participation of volunteers and non-profit operation – focus on the problem and not on the profit). All those factors result in the fact that NGOs are at times the best or even the only possible institutions capable of fulfilling certain human needs as well as the significant social role NGOs play in democracy.

In 2012 there were over 80.000 NGOs registered in Poland – 11.000 foundations and 72.000 associations. Approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of them are active.

As has been shown in the report "Polish NGOs 2012" the NGO sector constitutes a large and very diversified part of society.

The largest segment is involved in activities related to sport and tourism (38%), culture and art (17%) as well as education (14%). Among less popular organizations are those who are focused on health care (6%), social help and social services (6%), and local development (5%).

Most organizations conduct their activities only on local or regional scale. Actions on national level are undertaken by 28% of organizations, and on the international level by 10% of them.

Non-governmental sector is an important and visible actor in social changes that Poland is undergoing. However, its development is faced with many obstacles. Problems that NGOs have to struggle with mainly result from the lack of adequate funding, the lack of volunteers and obstacles stemming from a certain mindset and cultural bias (the level of trust in NGOs is still rather low and the understanding of the role of civil society by institutions and elites is still poor).

The chief obstacle emphasized by Polish NGOs (and, the meeting in Belgrade has shown – by Serbian NGOs, too) is the lack of financing, especially difficulties in obtaining stable, long-term financing, which makes the continuation of intensive, long-term work impossible, forces NGOs into periodical activity cycles and makes hiring associates very difficult. Less than a quarter of organizations (22%) work on day-to-day basis, having at least some of their employees or volunteers work every day during working hours. Another 16% of NGOs have no permanent employees or associates, instead irregularly hiring (and paying) people to do some work. The line between people volunteer their work and those who are employees is not always clear. It happens that one person is paid for some part of their work time and when there is not enough financing available, they continue their work without payment. Almost a half of NGOs (45%) doesn't pay for the work, doesn't hire anyone and is completely based on volunteer work. A half of Polish organizations don't have any property, even in the form of office equipment or software.

It is more and more common for NGOs to focus on financial partners who can guarantee financing, which in effect hinders the construction of social background. Most NGOs operate within the framework of grant projects, which on one hand imposes a certain level of professionalism and observation of standards, defined by grant donors, but on the other, pushes socially involved units into the depths of bloated bureaucracy, imposes artificial and formalized language on projects, and threatens the autonomy and independence of the organization. Operating "from project

to project" hampers long-term activities, but it can facilitate a transfer of non-governmental culture paradigms. The necessity of investing large amounts of energy into dealing with disadvantageous institutional conditions brings a number of dangers, which primarily threaten the mission of the organization. Non-governmental organizations lose experts, who leave for more prominent structures after having finished a project. Voluntary service is treated as an opportunity to obtain professional experience, but it is rather difficult to find people who are willing to be really involved in voluntary service. Efficient management of NGO is difficult, although dangers can be minimized by keeping to the ethos of the organization, by diversifying sources of financing, and involvement in various initiatives that support and strengthen the third sector.

Non-governmental organizations are not the only element that strengthens civil society, but they are its most significant component. Due to their activity, enclaves of civil society are formed, which radiate outwards into society and help in gradually overcoming many seemingly insurmountable problems. In addition, it should not be overlooked that civil society is formed primarily of and by people, and it is their passions, interests and inspirations, which are the source of any civil activity.

Bibliography:

Czapiński J. (2011), Aktywność obywatelska szanse i bariery. Biuletyn Forum Debaty Publicznej No. 4, May 2011

Gliński P. (2006) Style działań organizacji pozarządowych w Polsce. Grupy interesu czy pożytku publicznego?

Przewłocka J. (2013) Polskie organizacje pozarządowe 2012. Badania aktywności obywatelskiej

Emil Majuk

PUT U BUDUĆNOST - CIVILNO DRUŠTVO I NEVLADINE ORGANIZACIJE U POLJSKOJ

Rezultati aktivnosti mnogih nevladinih organizacija pokazuju da, tokom političke krize, shvaćene na tradicionalan način, civilno društvo zapravo daje efektivnije odgovore na izazove današnjice nego što to mogu institucije državne i lokalne vlasti. Nedavni događaji u Kijevu - pobjeda samoorganizovane grupe ljudi nad autoritarnim režimom Viktora Janukoviča - nedvosmisleno su pokazali svu snagu civilnog društva.

Rečima profesora Januša Čapinskog, koji već duže vremena rukovodi poljskom nacionalnom anketom po imenu „Socijalna dijagnoza“, aktivno građanstvo, koje je još uvek retkost u Poljskoj, civilno društvo, koje još uvek nije ostvareno čak ni 21 godinu nakon pada komunizma, kao i ono što se široko definiše kao društveni kapital, predstavljaju najveće izazove pred našom zemljom. Upravo taj kapital određuje da li ćemo otići dalje ili ćemo zastati u našem napretku. Susret sa predstavnicima nevladinih organizacija u Srbiji je potvrdio moje uverenje da postoji veliki neiskorišćen potencijal za društveno organizovanje. Pored toga, pokazao je da su i snage srpskih organizacija i problemi s kojima se bore slični izazovima s kojima se suočavaju poljske organizacije.

Nevladine organizacije dele sledeće osobine: inovativnost, kreativnost, fleksibilnost operisanja, posvećenost, spremnost ljudi koji rade u njima da se žrtvuju, sposobnost da uoče društvene potrebe i probleme (naročito socijalno problematična i osetljiva pitanja), sposobnost da nađu rešenja za ove vrste problema kroz blizak kontakt sa ljudima na koje problem utiče (npr. beskućnici, bolesni, marginalizovani itd.), relativno niske troškove rada (učestice volontera i neprofitno poslovanje – fokus na problem, a ne na profit). Svi ovi faktori rezultiraju činjenicom da su nevladine organizacije u nekim slučajevima najbolja ili jedina institucija koja može da ispuni određene ljudske potrebe, kao i da igraju značajnu društvenu ulogu u demokratiji.

U 2012. je postojalo preko 80.000 nevladinih organizacija u Poljskoj – 11.000 fondacija i 72.000 udruženja. Približno $\frac{3}{4}$ su aktivne. Kao što je pokazano u izveštaju „Poljske NVO u 2012“, NVO sektor čini veliki i diverzifikovan segment društva.

Najveći procenat organizacija se bavi aktivnostima vezanim za sport i

turizam (38%), zatim kulturu i umetnost (17%), kao i obrazovanje (14%). Među manje popularnim organizacijama su one koje su fokusirane na zdravstvenu negu (6%), socijalnu pomoć i socijalne službe (6%) i lokalni razvoj (5%).

Većina organizacija svoje aktivnosti sprovodi na lokalnom ili regionalnom nivou. Akcije na nacionalnom nivou sprovodi 28 % organizacija, a svega 10% to čini na internacionalnom nivou.

Nevladin sektor je značajan i vidljiv činilac društvenih promena kroz koje prolazi Poljska. Međutim, njegov razvoj nailazi na mnogobrojne prepreke. Problemi s kojima se suočavaju NVO su većinom rezultat nedostatka adekvatnih finansijskih sredstava, manjka volontera i prepreka koje potiču iz određenog mentaliteta i kulturnih predrasuda (nivo poverenja u NVO je i dalje prilično nizak i razumevanje njihove uloge u civilnom društvu od strane institucija i elita je i dalje slabo).

Glavna prepreka koju ističu poljske NVO (a, kao što je pokazao susret u Beogradu, to važi i za srpske) jeste nedostatak finansijskih sredstava, naročito poteškoće pri obezbeđivanju stabilnog, dugoročnog finansiranja, što čini intenzivan, dugoročan rad nemogućim, primorava NGO-ove na periodične cikluse aktivnosti i čini unajmljivanje saradnika veoma teškim. Manje od četvrtine organizacija (22%) radi svakodnevno tj. bar deo njihovih zaposlenih radi svaki dan tokom radnog vremena. Još 16% organizacija nema stalne zaposlene niti saradnike, već zapošljava (i plaća) ljude na projektima. Granica između volontera i zaposlenih nije uvek jasna. Događa se da osoba bude plaćena za deo svog radnog vremena, a kada nema dovoljno sredstava, nastavlja da radi bez nadoknade. Skoro polovina (45%) ne plaća rad, nikog ne zapošljava i u potpunosti se oslanja na volonterski rad. Polovina poljskih nevladinih organizacija nema nikakvu imovinu, čak ni kancelarijski pribor ili softver.

Sve je učestaliji slučaj da se nevladine organizacije vezuju za finansijske partnere koji mogu da garantuju finansiranje, što u praksi otežava izgradnju društvene podloge. Većina nevladinih organizacija operiše u okviru grantova za projekte, što sa jedne strane nameće određeni nivo profesionalizma i poštovanja standarda koje definišu donatori, a sa druge strane gura društveno angažovane organizacije u naručje narasle birokratije, nameće veštački i formalizovan jezik projektima i ugrožava autonomiju i nezavisnost organizacije. Rad „od projekta do projekta“ sputava dugoročne aktivnosti, ali može i da pospeši transfer nevladinih kulturnih paradigmi. Neophodnost ulaganja velike količine energije u prevazilaženje nepogodnih institucionalnih uslova sa sobom nosi brojne opasnosti, koje pre svega ugrožavaju samu misiju organizacije. Nevladine

organizacije gube stručnjake, koji odlaze u prominentnije strukture pošto završe projekat. Usluge volontera se tretiraju kao pružena prilika da se stekne profesionalno iskustvo. Teško je efikasno rukovoditi nevladinom organizacijom, iako se opasnosti mogu svesti na minimum poštovanjem etosa organizacije, diverzifikacijom izvora finansiranja, kao i učešćem u različitim inicijativama koje podržavaju i ojačavaju treći sektor.

Nevladine organizacije nisu jedini element koji ojačava civilno društvo, ali jesu njegova najznačajnija komponenta. Zahvaljujući njihovim aktivnostima, stvaraju se enklave civilnog društva koje se šire u društvo i pomažu u postepenom prevazilaženju naizgled nepremostivih problema. Pored toga, ne treba prenebregnuti to da civilno društvo čine pre svega ljudi, i da su njihove strasti, interesi i inspiracije zapravo izvor građanske aktivnosti.

Bibliografija:

Czapiński J.(2011), Aktywność obywatelska szanse i bariery. Biuletyn Forum Debaty Publicznej No. 4, May 2011

Gliński P. (2006) Style działań organizacji pozarządowych w Polsce. Grupy interesu czy pożytku publicznego?

Przewłocka J. (2013) Polskie organizacje pozarządowe 2012. Badania aktywności obywatelskiej

Svebor Midžić

Serija projekata u okviru programa za izgradnju kapaciteta nevladinih organizacija u polju kulture Engine room Europe (Kotlarnica Evrope) nam već svojim "krovnim" nazivom sugerise ne samo želju da se bavi mašinskim odeljenjem, mestom gde se proizvodi pokretački pogon jedne željene političke zajednice, već i povratak onoga što je potisnuto, što je bilo skriveno, i što je istovremeno deo jedne libidinalne investicije - loženja.

To i nije tako čudno, pošto kotlarnica i jeste podrumaska prostorija u kojoj nešto stalno ključa i može da eksplodira i o čemu se staraju ljudi koji su, u popularnoj uobrazilji, negde na pola puta između Polifema i poslovičnog proletera. Tako u serijalu filmova "Noćna mora u ulici Brestova" nadnaravni ubica, Fredi Kruger, "živi" u kotlarnici dok je Pera Ložać (1), lik iz vica, neko koga poznaju svi predsednici država koji dolaze u posetu Jugoslaviji (od Brežnjeva do Regana) i koji je u šatrovačkom govoru postao mesto upisivanja simpatičnog običnog čoveka sklonog preuveličavanju. Kotlarnica je dakle područje rada sna i fantazije i implicitno je i mesto proizvodnje kulture.

Stoga nije zgoreg prepričati jedan anegdotalni, potpuno frojdijanski, san, koji smo imali prilike da čujemo na razgovoru u Kulturnom centru REX, gde su predstavljeni rezultati istraživanja Emme Dowling i Dušana Grlje o uslovima rada u NVO sektoru u kulturi u Srbiji, koje je deo programa Engine room Europe.

Otprilike ovako: u prostorijama Centra za kulturnu dekontaminaciju, koji je za potrebe sna izmešten iz Birčaninove ulice na liticu iznad mora, okuplja se tzv. nevladin sektor u oblasti kulture na konferenciji pod nazivom "Poslednji grant". Naime neki neimenovani donori su rešili da daju jedan veliki, finalni, "grant" srbijanskoj kulturnjačkoj sceni i sada svi mi moramo da se dogovorimo kako ga je najbolje potrošiti pošto novca više neće biti. Naravno, ključna reč te oniričke konferencije je "održivost" (sustainability).

Ovaj san nam sumira sve ono što smo mogli da saznamo o strukturi uhvaćenog pogleda radnika u kulturi u nevladinom sektoru u Srbiji i što nam je, prvenstveno narativna, NGO klinika Emme Dowling & Dušana Grlje potvrdila. To je mešavina milenarističkog osećaja imanentne krize, nalik onome što je Benjamin nazvao većitim Velikim petkom gde subota nikada ne sviće, i gotovo ranohrišćanske, katakombne, komunalne ideje

zajedništva radnika u kulturi izvan državnih institucija gde se odluke donose plenarno (da ne kažemo saborno) u okviru postignutog političkog konsenzusa.

Međutim, u ovom samorazumevanju jeste i deo problema odnosno krize. Naime, kriza nije samo u materijalnosti naše situacije, koja je kapitalistička, već i u našem mišljenju o njoj, a plenarnost radnika u kulturi nije akciono jedinstvo već stalni poziv na predpolitičku esnafsku solidarnost. Kao što se na samom razgovoru/predstavljanju rezultata projekta moglo i čuti, nisu svi radnici u kulturi u istoj poziciji niti o svojoj situaciji misle sa istih, političkih, pozicija. Niti su njihove pozicije u jednostavnom dijalektičkom odnosu niti su čak svi radnici.

Njihove pozicije se kreću od prihvatanja sistema, njegovog infiltriranja do pune i voljne kolaboracije. Drugim rečima neki su Fredi Kruger, a neki Pera Ložać.

(1) Došao Brežnjev u posetu Jugoslaviji, obišao šta ima da se obide i najzad kaže: "E, sad bih da vidim mog druga Peru ložaća, radi tu i tu". Začudi se protokol, al' sad, šta je tu je, odvedu ga u ložionicu, on se izljubi i ispriča sa Perom ložaćem i posle vrati u SSSR.

Ista stvar bila kad je došao Regan: "Ja bih još da vidim i Peru ložaća", odvedu oni njega, Pera mu vikne: "Zdravo, Ronalde, kako si bre", i tu se siti ispričaju...

Čudili se svi kako Pera ložać zna tako važne ljude a on kaže "Ma ništa to nije, znam ja i Papu". Nisu mu verovali, padne opklada, i Pera i jedan njegov kolega odu u Vatikan. Uđe tamo Pera u papsku palatu i posle izvesnog vremena izlazi na terasu Papa da pozdravi narod, a pored njega Pera ložać, slatko pričaju. Uto će jedan iz mase:
- Ko je bre onaj u kapici pored Pere ložaća?

Svebor Midžić

Engine Room Europe – the “umbrella” name of a series of programs aimed at building up the capacity of projects in the area of cultural NGOs - suggests to us a desire not only to deal with engines, a place where the motive power of a desired political community is produced, but to equally deal with the return of that which was repressed, hidden, a part of a libidinal investment – the fuel.

This is not really strange, since an engine room is usually in the basement, it is a space where something is always boiling and in danger of exploding any minute. People who take care of it are, at least in popular imagination, stuck halfway between Polyphemus and proverbial proles. In “Nightmare on Elm Street” film series, the supernatural killer Freddy Krueger “lives” in an engine room. A popular joke from the socialist Yugoslavia featured Pera the engine room guy, whom every president that comes to visit Yugoslavia (from Brezhnev to Reagan) knows and who has in popular speech become a spot to inscribe any ordinary, likeable, man who likes to brag. The engine room is then a space of dream-work and fantasy and is implicitly a place where culture is produced.

In that light, it is not bad to reiterate one anecdotal, Freudian even, dream that we had the chance to hear during the talks that followed the presentation of the research that was that was conducted by Emma Dowling and Dušan Grlja as a part of the Engine room Europe program on working conditions in cultural NGOs in Serbia.

It goes something like this: At the Center for Cultural Decontamination, which has for this occasion been transported to a seaside cliff, there is a gathering of local Serbian cultural NGO scene. This conference is titled: The Last Grant. Some unnamed funders have decided to grant one final, huge, grant to the Serbian independent cultural scene and everybody has come here to decide what is to be done with this money. Of course, the keyword of this oneiric conference is “sustainability”.

This dream sequence sums up everything there is to know about the structure of the frozen view of the Serbian independent cultural worker and what has been confirmed by the mostly narrative NGO clinic conducted by Emma Dowling and Dušan Grlja. It is mixture of millennial feeling of imminent crisis, akin to what Benjamin called The Eternal Good Friday, where Saturday never dawns, almost like an early catacomb Christian communal idea of togetherness of workers in culture outside

state institutions who reach all their decisions plenary (not to say in council) within a framework set up by prior political agreement.

But this self-image is a part of the crisis. The crisis is not only a part of the material of our situation, which is capitalist, but also of our way of thinking about those material conditions. This mutuality is not unity through action but a constant call for pre-political guild solidarity. As we could hear at this presentation not all workers in culture share the same position and opinion. Nor are their positions in some kind of dialectical relation – and they are not all workers, even.

Their political positions go from an acceptance of the system, over infiltration tactics, to full and willing collaboration. In other words, some are Freddy Krueger and others are Pera the engine room guy.

(1) The Soviet president Brezhnev came to visit Yugoslavia. After he visited all that there was to visit he said "Take me now to see my good friend Pera the Engine room guy. I know where he works". The protocol is confused, but what they can do? They take him to this guy and Brezhnev greets him like an old friend and the two of them have a friendly chat. The same thing happens when the U.S. president Reagan visits Yugoslavia. They take him to see Pera and they have a nice talk. Everybody is bemused that Pera knows all these important people, but he just says: "That is nothing. I know the Pope too". They don't believe him, so bets are made and Pera and one of his colleagues go to the Vatican. Pera goes straight to the Papal palace and after some time there he is on the balcony overlooking St. Peter's square chatting with the Pope who is about to address the crowd. His colleague is totally flabbergasted and then some guy next to him "Hey, who is this guy in a funny hat next to Pera the Engine room guy?"

Emma Dowling

lives and works in London, UK and is Senior Lecturer in Sociology at Middlesex University. Her current research is on the global financial crisis and its constitutive conflicts and transformations. Recent publications have appeared in the journals Social Justice, Cultural Studies – Critical Methodologies and Lateral.

Emma Dowling živi i radi u Londonu, Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo, i predava je sociologiju na Middlesex univerzitetu. Njeno aktuelno istraživanje je o globalnoj finansijskoj krizi i njenim konstitutivnim konfliktima i transformacijama. U poslednje vreme objavljivala je u časopisima Social Justice, Cultural Studies – Critical Methodologies i Lateral.

Dušan Grlja

(1972), radnik u kulturi, sociolog, član uredništva časopisa Prelom (2002-2010).

(1972) cultural worker, sociologist, member of the editorial board of the Prelom journal (2002-2010).

Dea Vidović

upraviteljica je Zaklade "Kultura nova" (Zagreb, Hrvatska). Radila je kao urednica i novinarka te voditeljica mnogobrojnih kulturnih i umjetničkih projekata uglavnom u organizacijama civilnog društva koje djeluju na području suvremene kulture i umjetnosti. Autorica je članaka o novim kulturnim praksama i urednica nekoliko publikacija. Sudjelovala je i izlagala na brojnim konferencijama u zemlji i inozemstvu te držala predavanja iz područja kulturne politike u okviru neformalnih edukacijskih programa te na Akademiji dramske umjetnosti. Završila je studij komparativne književnosti i indologije na Filozofskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu gdje je 2012. doktorirala s disertacijom "Razvoj novonastajućih kultura u gradu Zagrebu od 1990. do 2010."

is a director of the Kultura Nova Foundation (Zagreb, Croatia). She worked as an editor and journalist as well as a project manager of numerous cultural and arts projects mainly with civil society organizations active in the field of contemporary arts and culture. She authored articles on new cultural practices and edited several publications. Vidović participated and gave talks at numerous conferences, and gave lectures from the field of cultural policy. She graduated in Comparative Literature and Indology from the University of Zagreb's Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.

She holds PhD from the same Faculty and her dissertation research focused on the development of emerging cultures in the city of Zagreb (1990-2010).

Pd Dr Monika Mokre

Political Scientist. Senior Researcher at the Institute for Cultural Studies and History of Theatre, Austrian Academy of Sciences. Chair Woman of EIPCP, the European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies. Board Member of FOKUS, the Austrian Association for Cultural Economics and Policy Studies. Lecturer at Webster University Vienna. Lecturer and Module Coordinator at the Institute for Cultural Studies and Cultural Management, University of Music and Performing Arts, Vienna. Research interests: Cultural Policy, Politics and Arts, Cultural Management, European Democracy and the Public Sphere, European Integration, Gender Studies.

Docent, dr Monika Mokre, politikološkinja, viši istraživač u Institutu za studije kulture i istoriju pozorišta, Austrijske akademije nauka. Predsedavajuća Evropskog instituta za progresivnu kulturnu politiku. Članica odbora FOKUS-a, austrijskog udruženja za studije kulturne ekonomije i politike. Predavač na Univerzitetu Webster u Beču. Predavač i koordinatorka modula u Institutu za studije kulture i menadžment u kulturi, Univerziteta za muziku i izvođačke umetnosti u Beču. Oblasti istraživanja: kulturna politika, politika i umetnost, menadžment u kulturi, evropska demokratija i javnost, evropske integracije, studije roda.

Emil Majuk

is cultural projects manager, journalist and editor. Founder and president of the Panorama of Cultures society (pk.org.pl) (since 2003). He works at the Grodzka Gate – NN Theatre centre (teatrnn.pl) in Lublin (since 2005) where he is responsible for coordination of trans-border projects. He collaborates, among others, with the Workshops of Culture (Lublin) and the Museum of History of Polish Jews (Warsaw).

je menadžer projekata u kulturi, novinar i redaktor. Osnivač je i predsednik društva „Panorama kultura“ (pk.org.pl) (od 2003. godine). Radi u centru „Grodzka kapija – NN teatar“ u Lublinu (od 2005. godine) gde je zadužen za koordinaciju prekograničnih projekata. Saraduje, između ostalog, sa Radionicama kulture (Lublin) i Muzejom istorije poljskih Jevreja (Varšava).

Svebor Midžić

(1974). Pohađao Školu za istoriju i teoriju umetnosti Centra za savremenu umetnost. Član redakcije časopisa za savremenu umetnost i teoriju Prelom (do 2004. godine). Zamenik direktora, a zatim direktor, Centra za savremenu umetnost u Beogradu (do 2005. godine). Zamenik direktora Filmskog centra Srbije (do 2007. godine). Urednik govornih programa Doma omladine u Beogradu (do 2008. godine). Član redakcije projekta Kultura i umetnost u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji. Bavi se istraživačkim i umetničkim radom.

(1974). Graduated from the School for History and Theory of Images at the Center for Contemporary Art in Belgrade. Member of the editorial staff of the Prelom magazine for contemporary art and theory (up to 2004). Deputy director and later director of Center for Contemporary Art in Belgrade (up to 2005). Deputy director of the Film Center of Serbia (up to 2007). Director of the Talks Program at Cultural Center Dom Omladine Belgrade (up to 2008). Member of the Culture and Art in Socialist Yugoslavia project board. Engaged in artistic and research work.

**U MAŠINSKOM ODELJENJU 3:
NVO u krizi, kriza u NVO
IN THE ENGINE ROOM 3:
NGOs in Crisis, Crisis in NGOs**

Tekstovi učesnika i učesnica debate
u Kulturnom centru REX 12. jula 2013.

Essays by participants in the debate held in
Rex Cultural Centre on July 12th 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 cooperation with 11 other centers in the Trans Europe Halles - European network of independent cultural centers.

Tekstovi / **Contributors:** Ema Dowling, Dušan Grlja, Dea Vidović,
Monika Mokre, Emil Majuk, Svebor Midžić

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 Fondation for an Open Society and the Secretariat for Culture, City of Belgrade.

Beograd 2014.

CIP - Каталогизacija y publikaciji
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

37.06:061.2(082)

U mašinskom odeljenju 3 : NVO u krizi,
kriza u NVO : tekstovi učesnika i učesnica
debate u Kulturnom centru REX 12. jula 2013.
/ [urednik Nebojša Milikić] = In the Engine
Room 3 : NGOs in Crisis, Crisis in NGOs :
essays by participants in the debate held in
Rex Cultural Centre on July 12th 2013 /
[editor Nebojša Milikić]. - Beograd : Fond
B92 = Fund B92 : Kulturni centar Reks = Rex
Cultural Centre, 2014 (Beograd : Standard 2).
48 str. ; 23 cm

Srp. tekst i engl prevod. - Tiraž 300. -
Prema podacima iz kolofona, publikacija je
nastala kao rezultat projekta "Raskršća
istok zapad", a u okviru projekta "Engine
Room Europe".

ISBN 978-86-89891-04-1

1. Уп. ств. насл. 2. Миликић, Небојша
[уредник]

а) Невладине организације - Друштвени
аспект - Зборници

COBISS.SR-ID 206269196



FOND
B92



Powered by:

Engine
Room
Europe



www.beograd.rs



FONDACIJA ZA OTVORENO DRUŠTVO, SRBIJA
OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATION, SERBIA



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".

**U
MAŠINSK
OM
ODELJE
NJU**

3:

**NVO u krizi,
kriza u NVO**

**IN THE ENGINE ROOM 3:
NGOs in Crisis,
Crisis in NGOs**

Tekstovi učesnika i učesnica debate
u Kulturnom centru REX 12. jula 2013.
Essays by participants in the debate held in
Rex Cultural Centre on July 12th 2013