GLOSSARY OF THE PRESENT AND PRESENCE

MSUM

POJMOVNIK SEDANJOSTI IN PRISOTNOSTI

Glossary published by
Moderna galerija, Tomšičeva 14, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
tel. +386 1 2416 800, fax +386 1 2514 120, info@mg-lj.si
www.mg-lj.si

Represented by
Zdenka Badovinac

Selection of entries
Zdenka Badovinac, Bojana Piškur, Igor Španjol

Editor
Igor Španjol

Texts by
Zdenka Badovinac, Walter Benjamin, Izidor Barši,
Jože Barši, Mladen Dolar, Anthony Gardner, Marina Gržinić,
Andreja Hribernik, Marko Jenko, Gal Kirn, Taja Kramberger,
Tomaž Mastnak, Rastko Močnik, Nataša Petrešin Bachelez,
Bojana Piškur, Tadej Pogačar, Tjaša Pogačar Podgornik,
Marko Pogačnik, Katja Praznik, Igor Pribac, Jelena Vesić,
Igor Vidmar, Borut Vogelnik, Martina Vovk

English translations from the Slovenian
Marko Jenko, Ljubica Klančar, Tadej Reissner,
Tamara Soban

English Copy Editors
Murray Bales, Jeff Bickert

Graphic design
Novi kolektivizem

Printed by
R-tisk

Print run
2000

© 2011 Moderna galerija, Ljubljana
Supported by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Slovenia.

MG+MSUM
Moderna galerija / Museum of Modern Art
plus Museum of Contemporary Art Metelkova

Absence of History The discourse of history and historiography and with it the experiences of the past have survived countless critical reforms, revisions and scrutinous attentions. These have proven that history is often a tool in the hands of winners (Benjamin) who by legalising a certain course of past events also enthrone a (certain) part of its implications that preserve them as values for future generations. Nevertheless history remains an important sphere that serves for the explanation of and the finding of connections with the past. The articulation of past is that key act that generates a certain "historical awareness", with which we can gaze into the eyes of the "threats" and instabilities of the present.

In Eastern Europe, which from 1945 to 1989 was controlled by socialist regimes, there are as a rule no ordered, articulated systems of events, works of art or artists that would offer an insight into the entirety and complexity of historical experience, as they are either left out of "official" histories or their stories and legends are fragmented across different inactive archives.

The articulation of heterogeneous collective and individual historical experiences that represent an open archive of the past is necessary for breaking up the continuum of official, large, legalised, prevalent historical narratives that strive to unify and preserve the past, mummifying it in the form of history. It is the human, personal experience that formulates the fragments of the conglomerates of history and events, for each of which we must find an alibi as we go (Bahtin). Namely, for each individual events carry within a deep schism between *content or meaning of the concrete activity* and *historical actuality or uniqueness of its experience,* particularly when we attempt to articulate them with our own particular activity. The experience of human activity and existence is therefore that fundamental connection between history and archives of the past that we can and must re-establish and re-articulate over and over again. (Katja Praznik)

Amateurism seems a slightly contradictory term. Its suffix could refer to a trend or a sphere of activity that one could become acquainted with or that one could learn: it is as if we could become professional amateurs. Let us not dwell on whether this is possible, but instead use the word *amateurship.* The essence of amateurship is love – "love for ... (a practice, a thing, etc.)." This guarantees the absence of rules and laws that restrict professionals and experts. An amateur can act freely, without limitations and his activity is childishly playful. While playing with material, he quickly crosses the boundaries set up by institutions and thereby creates a potential for something new. An institution that is founded on guaranteed knowledge or expertise is often hostile towards amateurs because their bouncy practices endanger its hegemony. Despite this, amateur practices continue to cross the boundaries of the institutional sphere, opening, expanding and reorganising it. The present situation of technological and communicational capacities is a relationship between amateurism and professionalism; it is additionally complex because of porous boundaries and the speed of production. Here we must ask ourselves whether we can still speak about a difference between the two notions. From this point of view, the sphere of contemporary art is particularly interesting, because it should no longer include some privileged knowledge that would dictate boundaries and rules, but institutions continue to organise and surround themselves with certain discourses that set up the criteria for entering the sphere of art. These criteria are particular rather than universal and heterogeneous rather than homogenous. (Izidor Barši)

Archive An archive typically conjures up images of bookshelves, endless rows of boxes, folders, maps, and documents that sit waiting for scholars to discover and reactivate them, but the term has a more flexible application within the context of critical writing. In general, an archive consists of a set of traces and records of events, actions in a given period that testify about it from cultural, social, personal and political viewpoints. In an archive, a single document is ideally part of a larger body of papers including correspondence, diaries, photographs, drawings or press clippings. On the other hand, an archive is largely understood as a public or private institution, the guardian of several archives or estates. Already strongly present in the international movement of conceptual art in the 1960s and 1970s, but furthermore in recent contemporary art practices as well as in the recent theories and practices of exhibition making and museum studies, the need to document has become the object of enormous attention. No longer coming from the artists' engagement with archival methods of classification and presentation, contextualisation as a certain pedagogical turn that an insight into an archive can provide can be observed in many progressive art institutions and museums. "Living archives" of all kinds complement the displays of museum collections and temporary exhibitions, and engage dynamic and interesting solutions in their displays.

Increasing interest in organizing, structuring, documenting, and revealing the art history of the former Eastern Europe is, in large part, attributable to artists (Irwin, Lia Perjovschi, Zofia Kulik, Tamas St. Auby, Artpool, to mention but a few). Their endeavours in the projects discussed here not only represent the strategy of self-historicization but also contribute to the development of methods of artistic research and to theoretical endeavours imagining what, if anything, a shared history of European contemporary art might be. (Nataša Petrešin Bachelez)

Art in Public Space A common trait of critical thought practices on space is that they no longer treat public space as neutral, definite, non-dynamic, unchangeable and determined, not even as it becomes increasingly homogenous and abstract, but instead focus on the deconstruction of various identities, the question of the other or the colonization of differences, the networks of control in public spaces, gentrification, micropolitics etc. Public space as a lost model of the democratic ideal space no longer exists. Analogous to this is the obsolete concept of art in public space with its presupposition that both the public and the language of art are homogenous, and the so-called participatoriness, addressing all people or social groups in the same way through various forms of participation and increasingly becoming a part of neoliberal thinking (creative industries, creative places, etc.).

In today's understanding, public space is suffused with contradictions and antagonisms, which makes it essential for its users to enter the discourse of the political, in particular as regards the questions of the use, management, and the dominant systems of representation of these spaces. In the context of art this means artworks in public spaces are not just "made for people", since they neither necessarily invite participation nor fuse with the spaces they inhabit, don't uphold "democracy" or attempt to shape society with social consensus. Instead, artists expose the prevalent systems of the representation of space, try to activate the disregarded power of certain excluded groups, broach questions of what is legitimately present in these spaces and what not, what the mechanisms of legitimizing the power of those calling the shots are, and similar. (Bojana Piškur)

The Authentic Interest of the Museum Once the Western master narrative began to fragment – and with it so did the universalist models of the museum – it became necessary to define as clearly as possible the needs of local spaces and methods through which they could be included in international networks. Making connections – an imperative of the present age – requires daily adjustment to the circulation systems dictated by global capital. Not adjusting, it would seem, means relegation to the hinterland. Authentic interest, meanwhile, means the very opposite: a kind of not-adjusting to hegemonic positions that, in itself, has nothing in common with the cultivation of traditional identities or with isolationism. Authentic interest, too, is based on making connections; only now this connection-making is adapted to the needs of the separate spaces that are forming networks with those with whom they share the emergency room. (Zdenka Badovinac)

The Autonomy of Art Instead of depicting reality in the traditional way, contemporary art can sometimes jump directly into the political or social sphere. By doing so, in many cases, it achieves nothing more than to identify itself with the real and relinquish the autonomous space of the imagination. The autonomy of art includes the imaginative and the utopian – spaces which seem to not yet exist but which are, in a certain potential form, already here. And this is what allows them to develop their own emancipatory charge. This charge is based on both reflection about the world and, parallel to this, self-reflection. Art alone, as a discrete system, can establish a critical attitude both towards reality in all its particularities and also, importantly, towards its own hegemonic positions. Only as a discrete system is art able to consider itself in relation to its environment, and only as such is it able to take a critical stance towards that environment. Art's attitude towards the environment, then, is based on the relationship between self-reference and hetero-reference (Luhmann). (Zdenka Badovinac)

Back into the Future What is music? Music is art, a temporal and timeless sensuous sounding of an Idea or a sonic shining of an Idea. According to the prevalent code, popular music is merely sensuous, emotional, idealess, purely now: "no future" *an sich*; also a sonic metaphor of betrayal, of selling out: "under the chestnut tree I sold you and you sold me"; the sound of the basic message of present-day capitalism: "to live without an idea"; inacceptable in the global real socialism; conditionally acceptable in the local "alternative" as a concession to the "West", with no autonomy or Idea of its own, subordinate to the dominant Idea of the "bright future" forever still-to-come. Popular music was always a revolt – the globally modern one against the countercultural 1960s, the local one against the 1970s marked by Buldožer's progressive rock. Punk represented the ultimate rebellion (surrender) – globally nihilistic and "sub-proletarian", locally, in the gray idyll of the "consumerist Titoism" it was, declaratively, only against "boredom". But that was an autonomous Idea already, "no future" *für sich* and a disbelief in the system, a rejection of the idealess pop pleasure. It augured the local end of the "end of history" – Tito's death and the beginning of the decomposition of the State under the auspices of the global beginning of the "end of history", the dominance of (neo) liberal capitalism and postmodernism as its cultural logic. Globally, punk became popular and "died"; locally, it became popular and dangerous. Under the weight of the state's media repression it mutated into "state rock" and Laibach's mirror overidentification with the total(itarian) Idea – of the System, the State, and the illusion of the Future – with everything that was falling apart in reality. And that is falling apart now on the "victorious" side of the "Iron Curtain", with Rammstein as a symptomatic sensuous sounding/spectacle. The future and hope are over. Fear is only beginning: what can stand and remain (standing) in the wasteland of the real? Which "no future" has a future? Perhaps the one in an association in which the free development of everyone is a condition for the free development of all. (Igor Vidmar)

The Balkans Relatively recently, reasonable men who traveled from western Europe to the Balkans observed that people there had tails. Even more recently, in our own times, an American pundit saw ghosts in the Balkans. Since we have no scientific evidence for the existence of these phenomena, we may be induced to ask what kind of eyes were those that saw such things. Surely, a gaze like that had to be cultivated for a long time. Once it was completely formed, the Balkans appeared to that gaze as the opposite of Europe. Earlier, however, the Balkans *were* Europe. To be precise, when the ancient Greeks began to use the name Europe, that name designated a small portion of the Balkan peninsula in today's continental Greece. Gradually, the designation broadened to include other parts of Greece as well as of Macedonia, Illyria, and Thrace. Europe lay to the south of the River Danube. The first Europe was a Balkan Europe. That was the civilized world. The barbarians lived to the north of the Danube. That is how it was from the Roman Empire until the Crusades. Those crusaders – the barbarians from the North and West, from the heart of today's Europe – who marched toward the Holy Land across the Balkans, experienced it as an alien, unfriendly, wild, and hostile, awe-inspiring territory. Fearful, they slaughtered the natives and burned down their heretical settlements. But more important than that multicultural encounter as such was the following shift in the approach of the Westerners. In their minds, they transferred the barbarians from the left to the right bank of the Danube. Henceforward, the barbarians populated the Balkans. The fate of the Balkans, as Western eyes saw it, was sealed when the "new barbarians," the Turks, began to conquer it. In the mid-15th century Pope Pius II still called for the defense of Europe in the Balkans, but since that defense came to nothing, the Balkans were eclipsed from Europe. Now, the Balkans were not only separated from Europe by the wild mountains. Now they were also cut off, for centuries, from Europe religiously, culturally and politically. The standing of the Balkans in the West was not improved either by the killing of that Austrian Archduke in Sarajevo or by the establishment, after two European wars, of communist republics all over the region. The first Europe became and remained the other of Europe, where the West continues to liberally export its prejudices, fears, fantasies, ignorance and arrogance. (Tomaž Mastnak)

Collectivity In the 20th century, the idea of collectivity, of a tightly connected group of people who share similar ideas, work motives and goals, becomes the core of large political utopias. Therefore it is not a coincidence that in historical avant-gardes the collective is a key form, a tool, a means and a goal for the total reassessment of artistic production, its reception and function. With the avant-garde collectivity, which concerns both producers and recipients of art (until these two notions do not blend in the optimum projection of the most radical productivists), the focus of artistic activity is redirected from the old, romantic expressive subject to the material conditions of art production and also more broadly to the issues of social organisation and collective identification. In the 20th century and until the present, collective identification (the speech of the collective voice) that in different ways strives to influence the way society is organised, remains the sweet burden of art collectives that have succeeded the avant-garde criticism, although in different times and places types of collectivity have to be adjusted to the actual socio-political conditions; and despite the fact that in the neoliberal/neoconservative discourse of the post-Second-World-War period collectivity is synonymous with a threat to the free individual who is supposed to assert himself in the autonomous art of high and late modernism. After modernism, collectivity is a multitude of various micro communities (ranging from temporary autonomous zones to virtual interest communities, from urban gardeners to tactical media etc.) with highly varied agendas. What they have in common is a striving for the implementation of human nature, which as a social being takes on the responsibility for "living together"; but this no longer takes place as a way of representing some social form or struggle in the field of representation, but by making the (collective) activity in social life a form of production and the engagement in social life a media of expression. The old appeal "Bring art to life!", which contemporary collectivisms take over from their avant-garde predecessors, is not manifested as an image or an escape from the image, but as a form of partial, temporary, micro, makeshift social construct that can emerge any time and any place. (Martina Vovk)

Contemporary Art has two beginnings: a conceptual beginning in the 1960s, that is, the period of formation for most of the aesthetic concepts that shaped a critical position towards such basic postulates of modernism as, notably, the total autonomy of art, the notion of the originality of the artwork, and the neutrality of the white cube; and a chronological beginning in the early 1990s, when a new era began that was marked by the fall of the communist regimes, the end of Yugoslavia and certain other multinational states, accelerated processes of globalization, and the ever-expanding use of digital technology. It is impossible, therefore, to demarcate the concept of contemporaneity, with its attendant concentration of artistic interests, in simple chronological terms. Thematically, contemporary art is strongly engaged with topics surrounding the processes of globalization and their negative impact on individual local spaces; the instrumentalization of technology, science, ecology, knowledge, and so on; the colonization of the private sphere; issues of individual marginalized art traditions; and the potentials and experiences of past ideologies and histories in the public sphere. (Zdenka Badovinac)

Creative Time Time does not equal eternity. Neither is time a denial of eternity. Time and eternity exist as parallel realities as long as time has an inbuilt component of creativity.

If time does not have an inbuilt component of creativity, we speak of linear time or time caught in its own limitation, under the rule of an anthropocentric concept.

The creative component of time means that the time of time is not predetermined but is born at the moment a person invests a creative or uncreative work with their heartfelt interest and unique inspiration, never before expressed. This can also be a sensitive touch of their hands or the enlightened activity of a machine they operate.

Creative time also originates at the moment a work is made, or an action or non-action performed. There occurs some kind of transcendence of linear measured time. Linear measured time can continue to be valid, with an alternative temporal space occurring inside its rigid structure. This gives the creative process the necessary space for its multidimensional existence. It even permits something completely contrary to time: it allows eternity (nirvana) to flow into time and "prolong" a moment into eternity.

The time of the fundamental transformation of Earth and the Universe, which we are living now, allows us to transcend linear time and experience eternity in time and space with increasing frequency. (Marko Pogačnik)

Decoloniality In the 1990s the Peruvian sociologist *Aníbal Quijano* developed the concept of the *colonial matrix of power*, which precisely shows that there is no modernity without coloniality and that the latter is structured at all levels of the functioning of contemporary societies (economic, political, epistemological and military), although it is most hegemonic at the epistemological level. Coloniality is based on colonialism and imperialism and connects modernity with epistemological and structural racism. Modernity is preserved as a whole by constantly establishing some exterior that is "outside" Europe and the North Atlantic (or outside "NATO").

Decoloniality, on the other hand, is *delinking* from modernity/coloniality and incorporates the experience of decolonisation and the anti-colonial struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America, as well as the positions of the damned and rejected in the world for a new decolonial option. The delinking from the colonial matrix of power therefore demands *border epistemology* in the sense of the division from the western *Europocentric* matrix of modernity/coloniality and taking place on the *other side of the colonial* difference, which includes the consideration of *geopolitical dimensions of knowledge and body*.

In the first decade of this century, the critical group of modernity/coloniality was founded, which represents one of the most important groups of critical thinking in Latin America and includes the positions of authors such as Aníbal Quijano, Ramón Grosfoguel, Walter Mignolo, Zulma Palermo, Catherina Walsh, Arturo Escobar, Javier Sanjinés, Enrique Dussel, Santiago Castro-Gómez, María Lugones and Nelson Maldonado-Torres. We could say it presents a radical contribution to post-colonialism, but unlike the latter, which includes in particular the positions coming from the former British and French colonies in Asia, Oceania and the Middle East, decoloniality is established beyond the framework of Eurocentric colonial epistemological thought and mostly in Latin America. (Marina Gržinić)

Democracy To speak of democracy is to speak of ambiguous politics. Historically, across East and West, democracy signified a politics of resistance against totalitarianism. It signalled the hope that government could again be of the people, by the people, and for the people, rather than just for the Party or a particular leader. Today, however, if neoliberal capitalism is the economic form of globalization, then democracy is its political wing. Both emerged as "victorious" after the collapse of European Communism, spreading from West to East in the name of reconstruction and "transition." Both remain hegemonic, determining which countries can be assimilated into the European Union or the International Community of countries that share certain commodities, consumerist drives, and political values in common.

Contemporary art reflects this ambiguity. Certain mediums are believed to be inherently democratic, and ideal for promoting democracy through culture worldwide (such as installation, public art, and participatory and relational aesthetics). At the same time, these mediums have also been crucial to the critique of democracy as the new political hegemony that art is expected to serve (in, e.g., the work of Thomas Hirschhorn, Neue Slowenische Kunst or Christoph Büchel). In art and politics alike, then, democracy designates the struggle for and against integration into global legitimacy. It is a politics caught between different values and possibilities: between its Cold War histories and neoliberal present, and between a form of social governance, a form of optimism, and a form of ideology. (Anthony Gardner)

Digital Museum In order to define the digital museum it is first necessary to establish certain relations: the relation to the traditional museum, to time, and to the museum object. The digital museum can be also determined, in part, by its difference from the traditional museum, that is, as an anti-museum. Representing stability and tradition, the traditional museum is inseparably linked with the notion of authority and the aspiration toward eternity. The digital museum is, in contrast, unstable; its existence is marked by fragility entailed in both the software and physical aspects. Chronological time as such plays no role in the digital museum, what is established instead is parallel intervals of time. While the traditional museum's ultimate dream is eternity,[1] whose prerequisite is stability, the digital museum's ultimate dream is eternal flow, change, and variation. The digital museum does not deny time; rather, it presupposes the disappearance of one temporality and the emergence of simultaneousness by creating virtual temporal lines.

To paraphrase Baudrillard's words about science emerging after its object is dead, we could say the digital museum emerges with the death of the traditional museum object.[2] The preconditions for the emergence of the digital museum arose simultaneously with the changed perception of the artwork as it shifted from its material aspect to processuality and transience. This has led, on the one hand, to immaterial and multimedia artworks and, on the other, to contemporary artworks deriving their significance from their contextualization, made possible by contemporary technologies.[3] This also resulted in the death of the museum object in the sense of the traditional definition of uniqueness and unrepeatableness, allowing the birth of the museum non-object, dematerialized, processual, and reproducible.[4]

The digital thus becomes embedded in the basic structure of the museum and inextricably linked with the museum object, its perception, mode of presentation, and, consequently, the process of work. In this way the digital museum creates fluid collections of data and enables networking. The limitations of the digital museum are no longer those of space, but are contained in its program code, whose implementation also affects the constituting of the awareness of the present. The digital museum is not only a consequence of the development of the technology, but also of ideology. (Andreja Hribernik)

The East as a notion that covers a loosely defined area spreading from Central Europe towards Central Asia, has roughly been understood in two main ways. The first understanding belongs to "the fall of communism" paradigm. It explains the present with a certain idea of the past – an idea that curiously de-historicises the past to which it itself belongs. It ascribes the "fall of communism" to immanent features of historical socialist systems – and not to political and social struggles within socialist systems themselves. It tells us that the Berlin wall "fell" – and wants us to forget that it was torn down by the people of Berlin. While basically using the explanatory inventory of the Cold War, this understanding now turns it against the movements, efforts and mobilisations that formerly enjoyed certain sympathy within anti-communist ideologists. Recent debates about Hungary 1956 showed the selective nature of this account: workers' councils established during the Hungarian revolution of '56 do not fit into its scheme. This view cannot accommodate the fact that freedom of expression was won in large parts of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia during the mid-1980s, as a result of the federation-wide mobilisation to oppose the last mounted trial against six Belgrade intellectuals who organised a "free university". Rather than having an explanatory value, this notion of the East performs an act of historical amnesia – it erases the political dimension from the Eastern past, and achieves equivalent effects in the present.

---

[1] Carlos Basualdo, *Interaction – Artistic Practice in the Network* (New York: D.A.P./Eyebeam Atelier, 2001).

[2] Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacres et Simulation* (Paris: Galilée, 1981).

[3] Janez Strehovec, *Demonsko estetsko: Od filozofske teorije umetnosti k estetiki kot teoriji estetizacij* (Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1995).

[4] Annette Hünnekens, *Expanded Museum. Kulturelle Erinnerung und virtuelle Realitaeten* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2002).

The other way to understand the notion of the East would be to explain the past with the knowledge of the present. One of the prominent contemporary processes is the disintegration of the social state. Quite revealingly, the construction of the social state after World War II is a feature that is common both to the East and to the standpoint *from where* it appears as the East, i.e., to Western Europe. The destruction of the social state is equally revealing: first in the West during the 1980s, then in the East in the 1990s. Within such an integrated historical account, we would understand historical socialisms as variants of the social state upon the periphery of the capitalist world system. The Western social state in the developed centre of the capitalist system was an achievement of the working classes' struggles within the frame of the post-revolutionary state, first established by the French Revolution, and politically constituted upon the "sovereignty of the people". On the underdeveloped periphery, the social state had also been historically made possible by a revolution, the October revolution; it likewise developed within a *politicised* frame, this time based upon the "dictatorship of the proletariat". In both the central and the peripheral variants, the institutional political frame has been usurped by the party-state administrative and political groups that claimed to *represent* the "people" and the "proletariat" respectively. They were soon criticised by the people they claimed to represent: as "partitocracy" (the rule of a closed pool of parties) in

the West, and as "bureaucracy" (the autocracy of one party) in the East. In neither case has the usurpation of the political apparatus prevented popular struggles continuing, and therefore the creation of a specific historical construction of the "social state". (Rastko Močnik)

Event *n.*, "something that happens, especially when it is unusual or important" (Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary); an event is a complex, layered notion or a problem, for instance in art: one now rarely speaks of the event of art, and more often than not of an art event or an event in art, be it in terms of a certain groundbreaking work of art, also a manifestation, a happening, a performance, an interpretation, a deciding opinion, these days even an opening of an exhibition etc. – one therefore predominantly and cynically thinks of the art of the event or the art of events, namely the savvy of producing (in all truth nothing but social and networking) events, basically goings-on or spectacles as a more or less involuntary sign of disempowerement, vacuity and feeblemindedness of the so-called art world, but at the same time also as a broader, much more disconcerting sign of the agony of maintaining a breathing space of possibility of a new horizon, "»of something else than what already exists", i.e. as a sign of the struggle in maintaining the basic matrix of sublimation under the pressures of capitalism (see chapter "*Coke as* objet petit a" in Slavoj Žižek's *The Fragile Absolute*, Verso, London & New York, 2000). In other fields, one can think the event through the prism of Alain Badiou's philosophy (see his *Being and Event*, Continuum, London & New York, 2007), in history also in dubious historicist or revisionist terms where the notion of the event itself dissolves (for instance, "the Revolution did not take place"), etc. All in all, the event comes to light as something that has effects and consequences, of course deep consequences in thinking, feeling and action (however, we should bear in mind the question of reducing an event to its consequences). Today the word itself functions as a hunch, as a premonition of something that will finally have to be taken into account, of something that we will be able to be faithful to, both in terms of something *prior* (for example, the trap of the promise of an event, functioning as a presupposition of the final answer, of an unequivocal clarification that will finally give us true insight, a cognitive map, as a promise that we will find out or *witness* something, as the emergence of a new horizon or the self-evident and therefore previously invisible side of the already existing horizon, a shift in perspective, a discovery of something new or, on a lower level, of a mere novelty) and in a *retroactive* sense (in the sense that something, especially on the intimate level, can become an event in retrospect, as an always produced impenetrable core, resisting words and attesting to the failure of the process of putting something into words – one can speak of an event as if it were a question or even something "unspeakable"). This intimate experience can also be a group one, where the ones who need an explanation for what happened are the insiders or the affected, even self-proclaimed witnesses themselves, who can thereby find the basis of certain forms of collective or interpersonal ties. One can, perhaps, in this problematic of the event and the pseudo-event, notice the imminent dissolution of the fascinating aspect of the spectacle: when the mystery or the enigma of the spectacle is left to itself, the key lies in nothing more than an enigma or the advent of mystery as such, consequently in nothing else that could be behind the screen or on the other side of the curtain.[5] (Marko Jenko)

A Glossary of Contemporaneity In his song "Darwin Is Wrong", Frane Milčinski ("Ježek") says: "Man isn't one, man is two: one takes a stroll, the other toils." The same can be said about the history of man: there isn't one single history, but two at least, or even more. And there are also two or more contemporaneities. Contemporaneity cannot be described in absolute terms, but perhaps we come closest to it by mapping the concepts we constantly encounter in contemporary art.

"A Glossary of Contemporaneity" is an accompaniment to the exhibition *The Present and Presence*, which offers a selection of works from the national collection of the Moderna galerija and the Arteast 2000+ collection – a pioneering assembly of works from the post-war avant-garde art movements of Eastern Europe. This is the first installation of the collection in the new Museum of Contemporary Art Metelkova (MSUM), which developed as a result of the historical evolution of the Moderna galerija. The Moderna galerija was founded in 1948 as a museum of modern (then-contemporary) art, which over time became historical art. In the present essay I will try to summarize the basic ideas that have led to the design of the concept of both the exhibition *The Present and Presence* and the Museum of Contemporary Art Metelkova. To supplement our views on the basic issues of contemporaneity, we are compiling a glossary of key ideas related to contemporaneity, as I am discussing it here, from some of today's leading Slovene and international thinkers, artists, and curators. We do not want this glossary to be confined merely to the pages of this publication, but rather to extend its existence into both the physical and virtual space of our museum. The present publication, therefore, is a declaration that what we are creating in Ljubljana's Metelkova district is not only a collection of artworks but also a museum of ideas. (Zdenka Badovinac)

---

[5] See also Étienne Souriau, *Vocabulaire d'esthétique* (Paris: PUF, 2009), 701-702.

Heterotopia *n.* (heterotopias *pl.*), **heterotopic** *adj.* (from the Greek roots *héteros* – meaning different, other + *tópos* – meaning place = "other place"); a concept introduced by Michel Foucault in his lecture *Of Other Spaces* (*Des espaces autres*), given on 14 March 1967, for the Tunisian Cercle d'études architecturales (Society for Architectural Studies). With the author's permission the text was first published in the magazine *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité*, no. 5, October 1984. Starting from the difference between the 19th and the 20th centuries, Foucault underlines the shift from time to space (i.e. the shift from development and suspension, cycle and crisis, the ever-accumulating past, the increasing pressure and weight of dead men to simultaneity, juxtaposition, to the near and far, the side-by-side and dispersion), more exactly to the question of the fatal knot between time and space or as one might also say "the spatialization of time". Foucault then moves on to a short overview of the ruptures in the history of human and indeed always external "mental geography": the medieval hierarchic ensemble of places, its space of emplacements and directions (namely its *localization*; for instance the process of placing the sacred above and the profane below) was undermined by Galileo's breakthrough or his opening up of the medieval space of emplacements into infinity, whereby *extension* substituted localization. Extension is then superseded by the *site* (seen, for example, in such phenomena as the storage of data in the memory of a machine, the circulation of elements with a random output or connection, intermediate results of a calculation, and especially in demography, not simply in terms of available space for mankind, but mostly as the pending question of relations among sites). In opposition to Bachelard and the phenomenologists Foucault does not accentuate the internal space, which is never homogenous or empty, since it is imbued with qualities, but the external space as an ensemble of relations that define sites and the interiority of which we inhabit, yet not as an empty space: inside the ensemble of sites or, so to speak, different places, inside the actual processes of finding one or being placed, Foucault tries to isolate "special cases" which are in themselves a mark or an inscription of an irreparable heterogeneity, i.e. the inscription of the actual fall of the process of being placed, of creating and changing relations between sites into the ensemble of sites itself (in other words, the frame falls into what it frames: a certain heterogenous site or heterotopia is directly the finding or creating of a site, it is directly the structuring process of creating sites and relations between sites; one could say that Foucault's analysis isolates the produced heterotopic element that, almost as a now autonomous ground or background, cuts through the whole network of sites; the process of Foucault's analysis simply tracks down the symptom, in a way it is also wholly inscribed in the theory of the signifier or the signifying process). Heterotopia is therefore not the other space in the sense of being the second space, as a countable opposition to the first or third space, but the "otherness", the "uncanny aspect" or "self-alienation" of space, even the "space of otherness", it is the inherent point of space as such, its point of inflexion and at the same time the two-sided point of its creation and dissolution. It is both a mental and physical site, the layering of the in-between as such, of being neither here nor there. Utopias are not heterotopias, even if for Foucault they both represent two main examples of other spaces: as opposed to heterotopia, utopia has no real site, its relation to the real space of society is a direct or subverted relation of analogy (utopia as the topsy-turvy world, as a perfected world or the underside of the real world, showing the way out or the safe view from above). The connection or the difference between the two is exemplified by the in itself already heterotopic *mirror*, also holding an intermediary role, as the two-way point of alienation in the mirror (a point of "non-overlapping" and "double-mirroring"). The mirror is both real and unreal, it is transparency, perfect visibility and impenetrability, the strange appearance of "something more", of "something that regards me, that looks back at me". Yet from the point of non-overlapping of what is immanent, from its self-alienation, springs the premonition of a beyond (and the utopian) – this is strictly the point from which arises a fundamentally religious referencing to a beyond or to something or anything other (as in *analogy* or *metaphor*). Foucault suggests six principles or ways of approaching the description, the laying forth and the study of heterotopias, all six under the name of *heterotopology*: 1. there is no culture in this world without heterotopias and there is no such thing as an absolute form of heterotopia (there are two primary kinds of heterotopias, both linked to social deviance: crisis heterotopias, characteristic of primitive societies, although not necessarily excluded from later ones (priviliged, sacred or forbidden places, only for those in a state of crisis, for instance pregnant women and the elderly), and heterotopias of deviation (prisons, psychiatric hospitals, rest homes etc.); 2. a society can, during its own course of history, change the function of a certain heterotopia (for example, see the history of graveyards or burying grounds, linked to the changes in the perception of death and illness: their move from churchyards to suburbs); 3. a heterotopia can create more than one space or site on one single place, it is in fact, as a heterotopia, a layering of many at once (for instance, the complex role of gardens, theaters and cinemas); 4. heterotopia as heterochronia or a rupture with traditional time (in terms of eternity: cemeteries, museums, libraries) and temporal heterotopias (in terms of transience: fairgrounds, vacation villages, festivals, art events); 5. the presupposition of opening and closing: on the one hand, heterotopias demand exclusiveness, force or initiation, a certain ceremonial or a markedness of entering into a certain space (for example, the activities of purification in hamams or saunas), on the other hand they imply seemingly inclusive short "overtures" (motels and bedrooms on South American farms, meant for all passers-by); 6. heterotopias have two functions: they either create an illusory space that retroactively denounces everything as an illusion (for instance, the role of brothels) or they create a more orderly, even perfected real space – the latter can be called the heterotopias of compensation (seen best in the workings of colonies, especially Jesuit settlements in South America). Last but not least, Foucault concludes that the heterotopia *par excellence* is the ship as the greatest reserve of imagination in our civilization. (Marko Jenko)

Historicization is to a large extent associated with that which is just now arriving in history, as is the case, for example, with the history of Eastern European art. That which is just now arriving in history, however, is not merely a new knowledge that is included in the existing system; rather, it is something that necessarily transforms this system. Historicization, then, is based on heterogeneous histories, which are being simultaneously supplemented and interrupted. Historicization creates knowledge that is constantly interrupting itself. One of the aims of historicization is to oppose the single master narrative of history. (Zdenka Badovinac)

Igor Zabel was a comrade-in-arms for the Museum of Contemporary Art Metelkova and a curator at the Moderna galerija between 1986 and 2005.

Manipulations / Distortions of Time In communism, where 'time was yet to come', the idea was to delete the art of the past and to rewrite it in such way as to introduce new (art) forms into art history. Boris Groys said that communism was nothing more than the most extreme and radical manifestation of militant modernism, of utter commitment to the future. Therefore time was first deleted and then restarted. In art, as well.

The museums under communism were continually dealing with time. Space was ideologized and manipulated via the very notion of time: its mixture, distortion and confusion. Radical breaks occurred not when the artists interfered in the future, but when the artists distorted past time so as to change the very present, the *in-time*. But since this never happened within museums we can conclude that truly radical practices occurred only when the artist manipulated ideological time in such a way as to became historians of their own practices, of their own time. And this enabled them to rethink art history in a completely different way; not necessarily as a sequence of representations but rather as intensities or affects, where art had a performative rather than a representational character. The performative potential in question constitutes the power of imagining, a revolutionary thought where new forms of life and different politics could emerge. But this is only possible "not [with] a new chronology but [with] a qualitative alteration of time (a *cairológy*)"[6]. (Bojana Piškur)

Memory The function of memory as a specially connected group of individual recollections at the collective level (the dimensions of memory have been sociologically and conceptually defined by Maurice Halbwachs), in the course of which the collective can be anything from small (a family, an organisation, different groups) to large communities (the nation, state) is elaborated in various rumours (mythological, artistic, literary, musical, theatrical, dance, as well as in scientific rumours) within a certain community. Memory marks the borders of the oral, visual and gesticular transmission of knowledge on the one hand, and touches on large psychological categories, such as time, space and constitution of identity on the other. The French art historian Georges Didi-Huberman, who like many others has dedicated much of his life to the exploration of memory in visual language and has thereby significantly shifted the focus of research into the social imagery and art history from the rigid conventional to the dynamic memory discernment of meaning, maintains that "the image usually has more memory and future than the one observing". This memory surplus, with which the image reaches out to us, contemporary onlookers, is what should become a priority in the analysis of works of art or efforts to avoid anachronisms and understand the interconnectedness of meanings and relationships between individual visual elements and their layers from a specific spatial and temporal point of view. The history of images is the history of polychronic, anachronic or heterochronic phenomena; it is the history of the montage of complex, supradefined and temporally impure objects that are therefore automatically anachronistic. In order to understand works of art more pertinently, in order to grasp the temporal differentials of an individual period as particular memory messages imprinted in the visual language, a critical archaeology of art history is needed, which questions any conventional understanding of the object

---

[6] Giorgio Agamben, *Infancy and History, On the Destruction of Experience* (London-New York: Verso, 2007), 115.

(subject, allegory, example, influence etc.) and is open for further socio-historical reflection. A good example of the analysis of visual memory has been contributed by Jean-Louis Schefer in an extensive essay on the fresco *Deluge* by Paolo Uccello, which is even translated into Slovene. (Taja Kramberger)

Meta-level is a position M defined in relation to P as an outside position which at the same time could recognize and even incorporate position P. Meta-position M re-contextualizes position P by assigning a new layer of meaning to P while not forgetting its previous meaning. Constitutive notions that define position P can not be constitutive notions for the position M.

A copy of an original painting would be position M as a meta-position in relation to the original (P). All constitutive elements integral to the original are irrelevant for its copy. If the original is an abstract painting its copy on one level would be an abstract painting too, but on a meta-level it is a realistic or representational painting as well. While the original in a certain narrative could play only one role at a time, its copies could play different roles in various narratives simultaneously.

The story called Art History is a meta-narrative in relation to the Christian story. While for the believer the Christian story is perceived from within as the whole and overarching universe, from the position of Art History it is perceived from without simply as one of its several chapters. Furthermore all constitutive notions of the Christian narrative (God, Angels, Mary, Jesus, Apostles, etc.) are not constitutive notions in the Art History which is based on chronology and uniqueness and originality of its characters – artists and artworks. Thus any meta-narrative in relation to Art History would incorporate it, but would not be based on chronology and the uniqueness of its characters.

A meta-Art Museum would be a museum where works of art are exhibited not as sacred objects but rather ethnographically as specific artifacts of the Western culture born out of the Enlightenment, while a meta-Museum would be a place where the museum itself is the subject matter as an invention of the Western world. (Walter Benjamin, New York 2011)

Moments / Cairós Moments are eruptions of spontaneous creativity, flashes of liberation, instances of utopian consciousness that escape the daily programming and calculation. They leave traces since they break with habits and repetitions, instances that intensify the vital productivity of everydayness. Moments are being described as transitory, critical, creative, unpredictable ... and they produce fractures in our subjectivity, introduce a sense of freedom from categorical thought, discipline, common structures, restraints, and the like since they have not yet become alienated time. Moments are sensations of powerful emotions such as delight, disgust, surprise, horror, outrage, and intense euphoria and as such have a revolutionary potential. They can be, in a certain way compared to *cairós* - a 'supreme moment' for the ancient Greeks. Even though *cairós* liberates man from quantified time just as the moment does, it has a different connotation: it is not primarily a spontaneous eruption – instead, as Agamben suggests, it springs out from the actions and decision of man.

It can be argued though that it is only in a specific "space-time sensorium" or in a "configuration of a space as political" where debates about the foundations of society really take place. Therefore "moments" could be seen as a condition for an event of politics, which must also always have a spatial dimension. (Bojana Piškur)

The Museum of Contemporary Art and Its Time The museum of contemporary art differs from the modern art museum not only with respect to the time periods they cover – here in fact they can even partly overlap (the tradition of modernism remains alive today, while contemporary art also includes the history of this art). In contrast to the modern art museum, the contemporary art museum is further characterized by a critique of the construction and universal application of linear time and, consequently, also a critique of the modernist understanding of quality. "When artistic innovation is no longer thought of in terms of temporal linearity, it eludes criticism of this sort. Innovation does not occur in time, but rather on the boundaries between the collection and the outside world. ... Individual innovations, therefore, do not constitute a linear history, although they have an impact on the entire state of the collection and change the logic of later innovations. Such changes and restructurings cannot be linearized, for they are constantly redefining, or even reinventing, their own past."[7]

For the continued growth of the contemporary art museum, it seems important to underscore antagonisms rather than conceal them in the guise of a diverse pluralism. We must ask ourselves, then: Which antagonisms in particular should the museum of contemporary art be interested in? One of the main antagonisms that affect the museum of contemporary art is the antagonism between local and global time. The time of the museum of contemporary art can be described as the interaction between, on the one hand, local time and space and, on the other, the processes of globalization that are increasingly forcing us to adopt a measurable understanding of time and space. (Zdenka Badovinac)

---

[7] Boris Groys, *The Logic of the Collection*, 1997.

The Museum of Modern Art Before the founding of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, museums primarily looked back at the past; ever since then, however, the present has been important. Museums of modern art have been more interested in differences in time than in differences in space. In the modern art museum, time was also what determined the quality of the artwork. In other words, a superb work of art should be, in a sense, the quintessence of art's development up to that point, but at the same time it should also represent a transition to the new. With the founding of New York's MoMA, Alfred Barr inaugurated a new understanding of history that differed significantly from the one used by the museum of the nineteenth century. Nineteenth-century history was treated by art in terms of national schools, whereas Barr began treating history as a genealogy of international styles – a genealogy based on linear time. Although the museum of modern art was, to be sure, established as a museum of contemporary art, over time it became a museum of a past that only kept on accumulating as time moved ahead. (Zdenka Badovinac)

New Institutionality Current debates on the new kinds of institutionality focus not only on the crisis specific to the traditional forms of organization, such as trade unions and political parties (and not excluding universities and art institutions) but also on their constituent practices, on possible associations between movements and institutions, and on the so-called 'knowledge protocols' – structures of norms governing institutions and prescribing research, evaluation procedures, collecting policies, displays of objects and documents and so on. The questions is: what could be the possible new mental prototypes of art institutions today?

There exists a potentially new prototype of an art museum that is being created on the 'border'. These borders can maintain specific attitudes, which are described as a reactivation of micropolitical vitality, of politics of desire and of relations with each other. On the other hand, borders are also about their defense mechanisms, which "protect" the space from intruders, the undesirables. These borders therefore have a double identity. Under the term *border* a specific geopolitical and cultural position is understood, a liminal space between already canonized histories and a multitude of narratives, between the museum's constructed identity and a more fluid one that permits a variety of forms and experiments. The border is signified by social production and political struggles on the one hand, and the fixed system of values in knowledge production on the other, as well as between the notion of a museum as a heterotopia of time, whose function is to accumulate ad infinitum, and its utopic vision of social collectivity which could also be seen as a remnant of the past socialist experience. Border is also a situation, a kind of an anomaly between different translations: a translation of living knowledge into existing standardized categories, of artistic gestures of resistance into commodified objects, of operations of desire into institutionalized forms. The new museums would therefore become some sort of "desiring machines", not in the sense of desiring objects, i.e., works of art, but in the sense of producing new realities, new constituent dimensions, while at the same time radically re-examining their role in society. This would entail redefining their "mission", from collecting policies to evaluation criteria, the accessibility of information, the publics and similar, while creating different transversal networks, alliances and so on. (Bojana Piškur)

The new proletariat The disproportionate relationships between paid and unpaid work, work and free time and the increasing fragmentation of the work experience have become part of our reality. The space of economy tries to accelerate, dictate and organize time according to its operational logic, and that is precisely what has been happening in the sphere of culture as well - the rhythms of work have become more intermittent, fluid etc. and the accelerated time of capitalism has caused, among other things, the new modulations and regulations of work.

Subsequently there exist a variety of forms of precarity within the sphere of cultural production, which invariably lead to precarious working and living conditions. Most often (paid) work positions within the cultural (art) spheres are still considered privilege. One of the reasons for this lies in the inability to politically articulate all of the aspects of cognitive capitalism in the absence of class consciousness and solidarity and in the lack of understanding that cultural producers have actually become part of the new proletariat.

The new proletariat has not achieved any improvement in working conditions since the 1980s, under the illusion that capitalism was developing towards a higher form of labour and production, despite the fact that in some parts of the world immaterial labor has replaced industrial work. Contrary to expectations, the working class has not disappeared; it only expanded to include this new class of "overeducated and underemployed," which subsequently led to new forms of exploitation in the social fabric. Divisions within the working class have deepened, and the so-called cognitariat has become its most privileged section. What is more, the new hierarchy of struggle has given rise to another conflict which "fail[s] to anticipate the strategic moves by which capitalism can restructure the accumulation process by taking advantage of the inequalities within the global workforce,"[8] leading to friction within the working class, particularity of struggles, and the inability to interconnect. (Bojana Piškur)

Non-transformation of Cultural System and Cultural Policy Despite fundamental changes at the political and economic level, in general there have been no significant changes or systematic transformations of the cultural system and cultural policy in the post-socialist countries of Eastern Europe. Despite new forms of management and models of financing cultural production and recognising various production models, we still deal with two separate structures in Slovenia: the dominant public sectors and institutions with a uniform public service system, and marginalised independent cultural production in insecure working conditions. Because the way of financing independent art production is still optional – and because the relationship with the state in comparison with the socialist cultural policy can be still described in terms of repressive tolerance – the socialist separation between institutional and non-institutional culture still persists at the level of the cultural system. There are still two parallel systems. The non-institutional culture is marked by new, contemporary production models, knowledge of fund acquisition and involvement with contemporary international trends; but in terms of the system, it is still a foreign body and is not guaranteed financing via cultural policy, which would ensure uninterrupted functioning. In the public sector we are dealing with a highly regulated system of rights, salaries and public finances, which is governed by already secured rights, labour unions and the interests of dominant groups. Cultural institutions face problems because the main emphasis is on the salaries of public servants, while other conditions deteriorate. The transformation of the cultural system and cultural policy and the facilitating of equal access to public funds for cultural production generated in different organisational forms and various ways of managing of diversification of finance models are possible only with a radical reform of the predominant cultural system – as always, the problem is that dominant groups find it difficult to give up secured privileges. (Katja Praznik)

---

[8] George Caffentzis, Silvia Federici, 2007, Notes on edu-factory and Cognitive Capitalism, http://eipcp.net/transversal/0809/caffentzisfederici/en.

Operative Time Is not time in its fluidity, in its constant loss of the present, also our future? If the present constantly slides into the past, the place of the present is taken over by the near

future. This transformation of time is extremely important. It means that the future is being created through activity in the present – in the very present, which is disappearing and being constantly replaced by the nearest future. As if while living in the present, we already live also in the future. Naturally, this opportunity must not be missed. It is not merely a segment in the chronology of time but time in which we grasp and do something. We influence time, in the case of art, with art work that influences its time and at the same time has a potential for the future. The power of a work depends on the duration of this effect. It is *kronos* that we have appropriated, inscribed ourselves into and also expanded with our gesture. It is the active role of the thinker/artist that constantly re-articulates and operationalises historical events, places them in the present and thereby creates the future. Naturally, this is not fortune telling, far from it; instead, it is attention to what is symptomatic today and which manifests as a problem, the "solution" of which could create the future. (Jože Barši)

Participation The goal of artistic activity changes as works of art venture into social space, which is one of the key shifts in contemporary art: instead of an art object, it becomes a situation or an event. In this process, in a wide range of contemporary art, participation as a procedure of taking part in creation in the sphere of aesthetics plays a key role. Participation annihilates the difference between the producer and consumer of art and therefore facilitates a horizontal hierarchy in the process of decision-making. It is deeply rooted in the history of the formation of egalitarian and emancipatory ways of taking part in decision-making about common (social) issues and is, generally speaking, one of the fundamental political procedures for attaining a more justified distribution of power in political decision-making. Following this tradition, art practices that have succeeded the basic position of 20th century avant-gardes – striving to surpass the autonomy of a work of art and consequently achieve a blending of art with life (Bürger) – use participation as a key to tap the emancipatory potential of art. There is a broad range of forms of participation in this tradition; for example in the early period of the avant-garde, a radical annihilation of the traditional notion of art as a specialised and isolated sphere of activity with an ideal projection of the future, where in a classless society everybody will equally partake in anonymous collective creativity. (The most radical form of this vision was articulated by Russian (Soviet) productivits). A similar purpose of participation is encountered in post-war avant-garde movements: for example, innovative art practices such as happenings, events and projects that as a key to the implementation of a work of art demand that the viewer take an active part in its making (Beuys' "social sculpture" is thus brought about through the procedures of a referendum and public debates and eventually enters the sphere of real, formal political activity, in which the "staging" of a participatory democratic practice takes over the place of aesthetic production). Umberto Eco (*Open Work*, 1962) devised a theory of participation in the context of a structuralist interpretation of an "open work" as a form of a work of art, the meaning of which is made complete only with the reader's (performer's, viewer's) investment of thoughts and experience.

Today participation as a working method is omnipresent: it has been adopted by corporate ideology (as a way of encouraging the maximising of profit through the psychology of loyalty and adherence), mass media (with reality shows as a form of aggressive participation in the banalities of an individual's intimate life) and social networks (as adherence to a virtual community at the cost of relinquishing control over one's personal data). Consequently, there is nothing reliably redemptive in the use of participation. Despite the trappings of the cynically disenchanted time, participation seems to continue to take up a large portion of contemporary art practices. Particularly important are those that in the protocols of participation in the production and reception of art activities assume the legitimate burden of searching for a way to establish and strengthen weakened or annihilated social ties and consequently include the risk that participation only discloses the real social exclusion (of individuals or social groups) from any kind of decision-making. According to Ranciér, the only solution is the principle of equality that must not be the goal, but the basic point of departure for equal participation and for everybody, which would facilitate solidarity and just coexistence. (Martina Vovk)

Political Practices of (Post-)Yugoslav Art Within the framework of the reigning discourse of today that follows the development of "regional" art histories, the representation of the art of Socialist Yugoslavia is articulated in two different but interconnected ways. On the one hand, on the global level, it is presented as a part of something that could be called the dissident art of Eastern Europe – a narrative of brave artists as the voices of a rebellion against "the totalitarian Communist system" and fighters for the basic human right of individuals to freedom of expression. On the other hand, on the local level, Yugoslav art is fragmented and (re)arranged into a sequence of national art histories that are based on the "liberation" of individual artistic contributions from the "Communist yoke" and their "return" under the aegis of the native national culture, which constitutes an integral part of the process of consolidating the newly established nation-states. Such frameworks and interpretations of the past establish ideological narratives that are projective in relation to the concept of "contemporary art". They frame the historical reality in relation to which contemporaneity is to be produced and into which it has to fit. (Jelena Vesić, about the project Political Practices of (Post-)Yugoslav Art: RETROSPECTIVE 01: http://pp-yu-art.net/en)

Post-Fordism denotes departures from Fordism, which after the Second World War spread from the USA to the rest of the developed world. Fordism, which is symbolised by assembly lines is segmented industrial production (Taylorism) of large-series products, in which large numbers of industrial workers were included, together with a relatively high purchasing power component promoted by state regulation mechanisms (Keynesianism). But Fordism marked not only the beginnings of an industrial process, a special regime of capital accumulation and way of economic regulation. It was also a societal paradigm, a system of encouraging the consumption of standardised products and services, which can be recognised as the most developed form of Foucault's biopolitics (a systematic encouragement of conformism at the expense of non-conformism). Fordism failed in the mid 1970s due to various reasons. Developed societies entered the spiral of deregulation, which destroyed certain hitherto certainties. One of the reasons for the crisis was the diversification of lifestyles, which caused the reduction of production series and the growing prices of products. This non-conformist individualism also encouraged the development and diversification of the increasingly important service industry and its focus on specific niches and custom-made products. These changes were already indicated in Toyota's business philosophy (Toyotism). The company partially replaced its development departments with the buyer ordering a car according to his wishes at the shop – it turned the consumer into a producer (prosumer). These properties (outsourcing or the production being taken over by society, the de-hierarchisation in the network structure and the productivity of communication) have been unexpectedly reinforced by the phenomenon of computers connected into a (worldwide) web. (Igor Pribac)

Radical Education The ideas of alternative education have in the past decade became part of the critical discourse on the production and sharing of knowledge, on the status of art (and knowledge) as commodity, on exhibition spaces as spaces of spectacle, on new mental protopypes of institutions, including issues related to different publics, their participation, the emancipatory role of the artists and so on. The basic idea of the radical education project was to translate radical pedagogy into the sphere of cultural, non-material production, with education being conceived not merely as a model/tool but also as a field of political participation. Radical education aimed not only at interpretations of various forms of activism, or seeking collaborations with the new social movements but aimed instead at establishing a specific micropolitical situation within the institutional field (Moderna galerija), based on transversality, which was constituted through events, different kinds of alliances and collective actions (for example, organizing various events together with the activists of the Rog Social Center, Invisible Workers of the World, etc). The important questions that came out of these encounters were whether joint possibilities for politics could be created and how to work out these possibilities in practice.

The radical education initiative was aware that there always exists a danger that such projects and practices become included in the dominant institutional model where their emancipatory potentials are transformed into mere neutralized representations of some kind of alternative community. That is why radical education was constantly concerned with a number of questions about institutional critique and its expansion into a critique of social relations linked, consequently, to the systemic crisis of capitalism: Has critique become merely a form of artistic practice and, as such, already been thoroughly instrumentalized? Does such critique also contain a certain emancipatory potential based on values and, ultimately, also institutional forms that differ from those founded on neoliberal capitalism? (Bojana Piškur)

Retrotime There has been relatively little written about the use and understanding of time in the work of the group Irwin. I am not certain that the term retrotime is the most suitable, although I do agree with the editor, who suggested it, that the adjective retro can unambiguously refer to Irwin and that retrotime does, at least to a certain degree, make us feel we are dealing with a time loop, which in fact, we are. Since the aspect of repetition is nonetheless already familiar enough, I will just concentrate on two (related) answers to the question.

Retrotime as the no longer preordained 30-year delay, the famous delay that is among the things with which Pierre Bourdieu justifies the origins of modernism. This delay between the emergence of something new and the time when the novelty was incorporated in the norm allowed for the appearance of forever new isms at a predictable rate until the 1980s. When the Neo-Geo was launched in the USA in the 1980s, it failed to meet expectations. Not by being unsuccessful, but, paradoxically, by being too successful. The artists and the artworks were absorbed into the art system in the shortest possible time, with virtually no resistance. The resistance of society, which had made such leaps impossible for decades, literally giving artists time, a great deal of time, 30 years every time, no longer does so; at least not automatically. And since time is no longer given to art automatically, it must be produced.

Retrotime as the realization of the ability to retroactively select/establish the reasons which will determine us, and in this way affecting not only the present but also the past. The idea that the emergence of something radically new retroactively changes the past was first explored by Henri Bergson. The radical, the new, and the inclusion in the art historical narrative are constants in the field of art.

Henri Bergson: "I never pretended that one can insert reality into the past and thus work backwards in time. However, one can without any doubt insert there the possible, or, rather, at every moment, the possible inserts itself there. Insofar as unpredictable and new reality creates itself, its image reflects itself behind itself in the indefinite past: this new reality finds itself all the time having been possible; but it is only at the precise moment of its actual emergence that it begins to always have been, and this is why I say that its possibility, which does not precede its reality, will have preceded it once this reality emerges."[9] (Borut Vogelnik)

Self-historicization is an informal system of historicization practiced by artists who, due to the absence of any suitable collective history, are themselves compelled to search for their own historical/interpretive context. Because the local institutions in the non-Western world that should have systematized neo-avant-garde art either did not exist or took a dismissive attitude towards such art, the artists themselves, in various places, were compelled to archive documents related to their own art, the art of other artists, and the broader art movements and conditions of production. Today, in the work of younger artists, the strategy of historicization is acquiring new forms, associated especially with a critique of the new relations in society that are attempting to instrumentalize history. If, until recently, the subject of historicization was mainly post-war avant-garde art, then today – in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, for instance – these subjects also include the cultural legacy of socialism and the Yugoslav Partisan movement. (Zdenka Badovinac)

---

[9] Henri Bergson, *Œuvres* (Paris: PUF, 1991), 1340.

Self-management (with an emphasis on Yugoslav self-management) The *Critical Dictionary of Marxism* describes self-management as a rejection of bureaucratic administration, the Bolshevik model and social democracy. While Yugoslav self-government was quite successful in transforming social relationships, it failed in one particular area, namely the anti-institutional moment. A self-government labour policy must become part of the actual struggle rather than just a formal stance or slogan used by the ruling class.

In any case, Yugoslav self-government represents the first pivotal point in the international labour movement. While many historians date the beginning of self-government to 1948, Edvard Kardelj and Boris Kidrič look for the origins of this politics as far back as World War II, in the antifascist politics of the Liberation Front and also disobedience practiced towards the Comintern's policy on the Balkans. The disputes between the Soviet leadership and Yugoslav communists had piled up over the years, and finally erupted in 1948. As a result of the dispute with the Informbiro, Yugoslavia was thrown out of the socialist "camp". This put it in a very difficult position as the Yugoslav economy was then largely oriented to eastern countries. During these times, the lessons learned from the socialist revolution and autonomous partisan policy proved to be invaluable. The departure from Stalin meant embarking on a more difficult journey into uncharted waters. Thus, in numerous discussions, Yugoslav communists expressed a markedly critical stance towards the Bolshevik political model and introduced self-government. The latter – not entirely without historic irony – marked one of the few successful examples of development of the model of building *socialism within one country*. However, the political innovations triggered unanticipated changes in society as a whole: from a new type of managing labor organizations to a changed relationship between the economy and politics, to the working people's participation in workers' councils. One global and long-term result of the Yugoslav "schism" is the emergence of the "Non-Aligned Movement".

Self-government as the politicalisation of society as a whole soon became the ruling ideology, contributing to consolidation of the political class in the key body – the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. Despite its anti-bureaucratic position, the LCY operated through bureaucratic reforms. Despite its efforts to establish new institutions in an endeavor to disperse political power (which provided a forum for numerous discussions), it finally sought to seal and assume a determining role in the shaping of Yugoslav society in the final instance. The self-government policy brought about the increased autonomy of production (economic) units, undermining the foundations of the planned economy and creating an unexpected threat to bureaucratic rule. These self-government political practices proved to be most productive in small enterprises, in the cultural sphere and in certain parts of the urban politic. A particularly successful example is the emergence and development of cultural infrastructure, setting the stage for a grand cultural blossoming in all fields of art. Official Party policy legalized freelance culture workers in the 1950s, and a comfortable budget for numerous cultural activities was provided. Among other reasons, it used

this "artistic freedom" as a way to promote a different type of socialism around the world.

We can conclude that the Yugoslav model of self-government as a social formation was a combination involving elements of communism (Party politics, the introduction of new social relationships, the abolition of private property and the introduction of multiple types of property, expropriation etc.) as well as capitalism (the introduction of market mechanisms, the domination of the production of goods etc.). It was also a political experiment worthy of further theoretical consideration that would inspire future political practices. (Gal Kirn)

The Self-reflection of the Museum

Like art, its institution, the museum, is also opening up more and more to its environment, while at the same time it is also concerned more and more with itself. It understands itself as a relatively independent system with its own history, a system that is constantly re-establishing its relationship towards the external world. Today the museum introduces certain strategies of art into the logic of its work: for instance, it does not necessarily represent only art but also represents itself and tries to observe itself from a certain meta-position. Thus the museum confronts its own trauma, the process of its own instrumentalization by capital and ideology as well as by hegemonic positions of knowledge. Today, when all these pressures are intensifying and acquiring new and sometimes hard-to-recognize forms, self-reflection represents a necessary condition of the autonomy of the institution. Through self-reflection the museum understands itself as involved in various relationships in the midst of which it must maintain its own authentic interest. (Zdenka Badovinac)

Social Criticism is a term that can hardly denote critical awareness any longer, as its revolutionary significance is being replaced by the interest of capital.

The institutionalization of critical awareness attributes critical awareness only to certain artistic practices, thus polarizing the space of art into critical and uncritical spheres, maintaining the logic of the former division by media and type. This division suits the economic interest, which can only commodify the field of criticism by division/delimitation, changing the field of resistance into a field of consumption. Generating demand triggers an increase in apparently critical art projects, which only service the market without impacting the problems they deal with, since – unless reflecting the power of their own procedures – they only strengthen the position of the social authorities they harshly attack.[10] If understood as a practice bent on relinquishing the dominant discourses of the past, art cannot be realized only by thematizing current problems – even though this may already meet the demands of the institution for social criticism. The mere correct orientation or the application of a political stand in art do not intervene in the mechanisms of dominance, and the "struggle against repression" cannot exist otherwise than as an object of consumption without criticism on the structural level. The inevitable decline of every criticism into convention as a result of adaptation to the system (a condition of which is the structural change of the current state) is what requires a reformulation of artistic contents and procedures every time. That is why it is impossible to identify criticism as an attribute of only some artistic practices, since every such fixation means an a priori adherence to a convention subject to capital, blocking art and producing a commodity. (Tjaša Pogačar Podgornik)

Time and the Museum Collections Every institution, including the art museum, tends toward stabilizing experiences of *history that is not yet*, such as gestures of resistance, imagination, poetics, behaviours and similar by producing rules which not only establish what is meaningful, who has the authority to decide and who the privilege to speak, but construct canonized histories and specific knowledge about them.

Canonized histories represent an inevitable part of museum collections, which are subsequently linked to various concepts and experiences of time. What is more, every museum establishes its own chronological matrix precisely through its collections. The 'authority of time' sets up the collection's relationship with the past so as to position the works in a defined chronological time-line. The works then acquire the status of a commodity, and the set of rules prescribing how to keep their status intact is defined. But the accumulation of objects is not limited; instead, the process continues on *ad infinitum*. It is only under specific circumstances that commodities might turn into something else or that the process of their accumulation is halted; for example with transactions across cultural boundaries, in situations such as war and so on (Appadurai).

Our experiences of time in the collections can be altered, but neither history nor present can be fully grasped. The collector "extracts the object from its diachronic distance or its synchronic proximity and gathers it into the remote adjacence of history (...)[11]". What the collector cannot do is preserve, within the collection, the human temporality and its 'pure historical essence'. (Bojana Piškur)

---

[10] Hal Foster, The Artist as Ethnographer?, *The Return of the Real* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996).

The Time of the Modern Museum Museums are institutions that wield power, and have as such played a crucial role, among other things, in constituting modern and contemporary art. Museums legitimize and endorse the myth of objective historical representation in which a work of art plays the role of a document. This myth is based on a linear understanding of time (and history), on gradualism, and on a clear-cut orientation toward the future. The museum originated in the Renaissance, when some radical changes occurred in universities and museums in the West. It represents a typical example of the "accumulation of meaning" (Mignolo), like an encyclopedia. The method (art history) and the institution (the museum) emerged at the same time, and both were modern in their origin and in their goals. Museum time is modern time.

The origin of the museum is closely bound to the "economic accumulation" of modernism in the West, to the practice and politics of colonialism (the need to civilize barbarians and the primitives outside history). As a rule, this ideological foundation of the museum is covert.

For several centuries there prevailed the notion that the art

museum had an immutable identity. Contemporary art and globalization have changed that. Almost an antithesis to the concept of the universalism of modernism, globalization allows for "multiple modernities". This has reduced the notion of modernity to a historical definition, depriving it of the authority of a universal model. Today, the museums of the world face an important transformation, in the process of which they may play a liberating social role. In order to do so, they should take some radical steps: above all, cast a critical eye on their own (ideological) foundations and on the concept of time they represent; moreover, they should also divulge the "basic syntax" of their colonialist power, open up to the dialogic plurality of discourses, point out the conflictual relationships, interests and histories in analyzing the chosen objects and phenomena, introduce a plurality of concepts of museum time and similar. (Tadej Pogačar)

Universal in art is such a broad subject it can only be broached particularly. For this reason my point of departure will be a single quotation.

Toward the end of his "Introduction" to *Grundrisse* (1857), Karl Marx makes a somewhat unexpected digression about Greek mythology and art. He asks: "From another side, is Achilles possible with powder and lead? (...) Do not the songs and the saga and the muse necessarily come to an end with the printer's bar, hence do not the necessary conditions of epic poetry vanish?" Then he adds, almost as an afterthought: "But the difficulty lies not in understanding that the Greek arts and epic are bound up with certain forms of social development. The difficulty is that they still afford us artistic pleasure and that in a certain respect they count as a norm and as an unattainable model." (*Grundrisse*, p. 111) Coming from Marx's mouth, this statement sounds unusual. The general direction of his argument could be summed up simply: to unmask universality. Everything that is considered universal, superhistorical, generally defining humanity regardless of the particular times and places, all that should be drawn back into the conditions of its origin and its historical presuppositions pointed out, as well as the social circumstances under which it had arisen. It thus needs to be shown that every universality rests on undisclosed presuppositions; in the end, the basic operation of ideology is denying its historical conditions and presenting itself as something generally valid and self-evident. This is also true of all products of the human mind. Thus it can be shown, in the case of every work of art, that it originated on a certain historical ground, in response to certain social questions and needs, and that it is thoroughly permeated with the social contradictions of its time.

---

[11] Giorgio Agamben, *Infancy and History, On the Destruction of Experience* (London-New York: Verso, 2007), 81.

But that is not enough. The way in which a work of art evades its social and historical conditions is precisely the way it can address us universally, across all distances of space and time; the way it is not merely a child of its time, but at the same time breaks up with its time; the way it has transcended the circumstances conditioning it and produced something that is not only a source of artistic pleasure for us today, but is considered a model; therefore, the way some particular historical means had produced something transhistorical and universal. So much so that instead of art being explained from its historical context, the opposite is actually true: art has the power to explain its

own context and in a sense be the one to create it.

Art – if we follow along the lines of Marx's aside – would then be the rupture of the universal amidst the particularity of the circumstances; the way in which these circumstances reach beyond themselves and reach everyone. Not by art detaching itself from these circumstances – this is never possible and there is nothing more boring than art directly striving to be universal and denying its attachment – but amidst its immersion in its historical moment. What really comes out into the open in art is how the historical moment is in rupture with itself. (Mladen Dolar)

Virtual Speed is the abstract speed that emerges at the junction of virtual space, virtual time, and the remains of real time. Before the categories of time and space became virtual, they had to be relativized, which occurred in the 20th century with the introduction of the theory of relativity and the concept of the speed of light in science. These concepts shifted the foundations of the way the world was perceived. Speed became dependant on the observer, no longer thought of as a phenomenon, but as a relation between phenomena, relativity itself.[12]

As the speed of movement increased, people lost the sense of space. And it is this loss that appears in virtuality as a phantasm, manifesting in the emphasis laid on spatiality and in the creation of apparent space (an example of this are videogames, where the orientation in virtual space is crucial, or VR projects in which there is still some vision of space). Digital technologies have opened the door into a world in which virtual space is constituted – cyberspace (William Gibson) that is essentially different from the physical dimensions of space, since space has now become a type of medium.[13] However, virtual space is not uniform; it is fragmented both in terms of program code and of the content and the visual presentation. In relation to virtual space, also virtual speed does not exists as a continuous speed, but is sequential, creating in its sequentiality, virtual time, which is no longer chronological, but can go in all directions. Virtual speed evades real time, since momentariness is one of its basic characteristic features; we say that things in virtual space happen in "real time", although this phrase no longer refers to real time, but rather to its disappearance, meaning that there is no temporal delay.

---

[12] Paul Virilio, *La vitesse de libération* (Paris: Galilée, 1999).

Virtual speed is therefore a simulation of speed, no longer signifying an actual shift of position, since virtual space has no spatiality; "movement" is only apparent and a result of a static speed at which data is calculated,[14] which leads to the synthesis of virtual worlds existing only in virtual space and time.
(Andreja Hribernik)

The West is the best. The West means culture and civilization. The West equals enlightenment, tolerance, pluralism, and democracy. But we need to be specific: The West is the best when measured by its own standards; when we see it as it wishes to see itself, when we do not see anything else, and do not look at it from someone else's position. However, the problem here is that the West cannot see itself, or look at itself, from within the West. The logic of its very name commands the West's referring to the other cardinal points, which define it. The West can never be West for itself, in relation to itself. For others, however, it could as well be the North, and direction which defines it as such is equally politically and culturally charged as the one in which it is seen as the West. Now, since the West is according to its own understanding the best, the West cannot allow others to define it. But since it cannot define itself self-referentially, it needs to construe those others from whose imagined position it appears as the West. With the North or South, the West is in contact and, however big the real differences in cultural or/and political geography might be, it can even merge with them into South-West or North-West. But we cannot speak of, or imagine, an East-West. This is why the East is the privileged point from which to see the West in its pure form, and this is why the West is permanently busy with construing the East. This East is of course exactly what it needs to be in order for the West to see itself where it imagines itself to be, and as such as it desires to be. As a result of all this, we can never directly find the West where it is, or is supposed to be, and have to look for it where it is not. If we want to see it, we are directed to the point without that place from where we can see it. But from these construed observation points we can see precisely what we have brought with us to see; or else we may ask ourselves how those observation points were construed; that is, what is that which we have brought in with us, why, and for what purpose. (Tomaž Mastnak)

---

[13] Lev Manovich, *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002).
[14] Marina Gržinić, *Spectralization of Space: The Virtual-image and The Real-time Internval*, http://www.international-festival.org/node/28702