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Trustees of The Museum of Modern Art
The Museum of Modern Art is proud to present Sanja Iveković: Sweet Violence, the first survey of Sanja Iveković's art in the United States. The exhibition covers four decades of Iveković’s audacious work as feminist, activist, and video and performance pioneer. Iveković came of age in the post-1968 period, at a time when artists were breaking free from mainstream institutional settings and laying the ground for critical and radical new forms of art. In the 1970s Iveković probed the persuasive qualities of mass media and its identity-forging potential; after 1990—with the fall of the Berlin Wall, the disintegration of Yugoslavia, and the birth of a new nation—she focused on the transformation of Croatia as it moved from communist to postcommunist political systems.

Conceived by Roxana Marcoci, Curator, Department of Photography, the exhibition offers a fascinating account of the artist’s complex oeuvre in all mediums from the early 1970s to 2011. Featured works include a group of single-channel videos recently acquired by MoMA, with Sweet Violence (1974), Instructions No. 1 (1976), Make Up–Make Down (1978), Personal Cuts (1982), and General Alert (Soap Opera) (1995); performance-installations such as Triangle (1979) and Practice Makes a Master (1982/2009); and a selection of photomontages from her celebrated series Double Life (1975–76), which employs pictures of the artist from her private albums juxtaposed with commercial advertisements clipped from the pages of women’s magazines such as Elle, Grazia, and Svijet. Iveković’s Practice Makes a Master will be reenacted in a series of special performances during the exhibition, and her sculptural installation Lady Rosa of Luxembourg (2001) will be featured in the Donald B. and Catherine C. Marron Atrium, with documentation of its original public presentation and critical reception.

This book, published in conjunction with the exhibition, includes ten texts focused on the artist’s distinct projects and two longer essays. The first essay, by Marcoci, offers a detailed historical analysis of neo-avant-garde artistic practices in the former Yugoslavia from the late 1960s to today, including the New Art Practice, the movement within which Iveković’s work first emerged. Marcoci’s essay examines the artist’s practice by connecting her explicitly feminist voice to issues of social and political urgency, such as women’s rights and political activism, and to public and relational tactics. The second essay, by Terry Eagleton, Distinguished Visiting Professor at Universities of Lancaster and Notre Dame and National University of Ireland, provides a distinctly philosophical context. In 2002 Eagleton published a brilliant study of tragedy, Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic, which shares its title with Iveković’s 1974 work (the earliest work to be included in the exhibition), and both writer and artist investigate the idea of violence in art and in life.

Sanja Iveković: Sweet Violence makes a major contribution to the reevaluation of significant women artists and to the discourse about art, politics, and social change in the period that spans the post-1960s to today. For their most generous support of the exhibition and publication, we extend our warmest thanks to our funders: Wallis Annenberg Fund for Innovation in Contemporary Art through the Annenberg Foundation; the Modern Women’s Fund, established by Sarah Peter; The Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts; David Teiger; The International Council of The Museum of Modern Art; and the Trust for Mutual Understanding.

Glenn D. Lowry
Director
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A great artistic talent and lifelong feminist and activist, Sanja Iveković has over the past four decades developed a critical practice that is crucial to understanding the relationship between art, politics, and social change in the contemporary world. She has dealt with a range of subjects, from the effects of mass media in her native Yugoslavia in the 1970s to the end of communism in the region (and, as curator Maria Hlavajova has pointed out, to “the end of a particular understanding of social democracy”) following the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the ongoing disregard for women’s rights that exists even in democracies that pretend otherwise.1 Addressing such complex matters in a variety of mediums—conceptual photomontage, video, public sculpture, drawing, posters, performance—she has continually challenged the status quo and the politics of power.

Iveković helped shape neo-avant-gardism in postwar Yugoslavia, a period in which artists developed new forms of opposition to official modernist culture. These developments were enabled by the unique course Yugoslavia took after the end of World War II, one that diverged significantly from that of other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

With the Yalta agreement signed in 1945 in the Crimea by the three main Allied leaders—United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt, English Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Soviet Union General Secretary Joseph Stalin—East-Central Europe found itself in the Soviet Union’s sphere of influence. In postwar communist Europe, where art often functioned as an instrument of propaganda, the neo-avant-garde moved toward decentralizing cultural power, through grassroots samizdat (self-published) literature, apartment exhibitions, street actions, and events in student centers. In Yugoslavia this decentralization was accelerated, as art historian Piotr Piotrowski has noted, by “the country’s character as a federation as well as the distinct art-historic tradition of the different republics and cities.”2 Further, in the late 1940s, as Stalinism intensified throughout the Soviet bloc, Yugoslavia broke decisively with the Kremlin and adopted a position of nonalignment in Cold War politics. Under Marshal Josip Broz Tito, who led the country from 1943 to 1980, Yugoslavia embarked on a series of economic reforms, which resulted in a brand of what might be termed liberal communism.3 At the core of this ideological system was a
pervasive sense of pride: Yugoslavia saw itself as a multi-national state unique in its defiance of Stalin. Political autonomy predisposed Yugoslavian artists to form cultural ties with countries such as Italy and Austria, rather than with those in the Soviet bloc, and facilitated the emergence of the neo-avant-garde.

The Yugoslavian Neo-Avant-Garde, 1950–68

In the early 1950s artists in Yugoslavia began a critical examination of social policies and the conventions of art. Zagreb became a center for Neo-Constructivist art due to the appearance of the artist group EXAT 51 (Experimental Atelier [Eksperimentalni atelje] 51).

Active between 1951 and 1956, EXAT 51 included members such as the architects Bernardo Bernardi, Zdravko Bregovac, Zvonimir Radić, Božidar Rašica, Vjenceslav Richter, and Vladimir Zarahović, and the painters Vlado Kristl, Ivan Picelj, and Aleksandar Srnec (the last three were also involved in the founding of the well-known School of Animated Film, Zagreb). Having come together in the aftermath of World War II, at a time when society was seeking to reconstruct itself, the artists associated with EXAT 51 attempted, on the one hand, to break from officially sanctioned art, specifically socialist realism, by using abstract and nonobjective art forms and, on the other hand, to achieve a synthesis between visual arts, modern architecture, and industrial design. EXAT 51’s manifesto urged an alliance between “pure” and “applied” arts, an idea inspired by the revolutionary traditions of post-October avant-gardes—Constructivism, Bauhaus, and de Stijl. Art historian Marijan Susovski has noted that EXAT 51’s interdisciplinary approach “was guided by a high feeling of moral responsibility for the culture and society for which the art was being created.”

When the group ceased its activities in 1956, its Constructivist aspirations did not die but were revived in the context of the international movement New Tendencies, active from 1961 to 1975, which was dedicated to visual research in relation to kinetic, geometric, systemic, and Op art.

Providing a counterpoint to the socially motivated EXAT 51 was the antiart group Gorgona, active from 1959 to 1966 (figs. 1 and 2). This loose-knit collective consisted mostly of independent-minded artists who had emerged in the milieu of tachisme and Art Informel, in which geometric form was abandoned for a highly improvisational and gestural style of painting, but shifted course to engage in proto-Conceptual practices. Its members—painters Marijan Jevšovar, Julije Knifer, Đuro Seder, and Josip Vanša; sculptor Ivan Kožarić; architect Miljenko Horvat; and art historians Dimitrije Baščević Mangelos, Matko Meštrović, and Radoslav Putar—shared an antiart object ideology with artists from the Düsseldorf-based Zero Group and from Fluxus East. Gorgona did not produce overtly political works. Operating outside official cultural policies, the group engaged in process-directed exercises, games, gatherings, and walks, and it organized exhibitions in Studio G (also known as Salon Schira) in a space rented from a picture-frame
shop. All the funds needed to produce their shows came from membership dues. Each member paid based on his current financial situation and was allowed to withdraw money from the treasury according to his needs.

From 1961 to 1966 Gorgona published eleven issues of the antimagazine *Gorgona* (fig. 3), which, unlike other periodicals, offered no secondary information, whether scholarly essays or reproductions of art; instead, each issue was prepared by a single artist as an artwork. Vaništa, the group’s founder, conceived the first issue, which consisted of a photograph of
an empty display window reproduced on nine pages; Knifer designed the second issue, with a black-and-white meander unifying the magazine’s front and back in a continuous loop. British playwright Harold Pinter turned Gorgona no. 8 into a literary issue, and Dieter Roth made original drawings (handmade, connecting lines on a printed pattern of commas) for no. 9.5 Mangelos’s proposal for an immaterial issue remained unrealized.

If the magazine consisted of no-stories and original antiart works, what was a Gorgonic event? It was any activity that involved paradox: mail art in the form of invitations inscribed with the equivocal statement “You are invited” and specifying no other details, walks around Zagreb to check out the beginning of springtime, uncharted wanderings through the city meant to confound routine experience, and a continual search for the ethos of Gorgona in the daily newspapers—as Putar explained, “We are not Gorgona—we are only searching for Gorgona in the world around us.”6 Once a month, one of the artists mailed to the others a philosophical or literary quote as a means of defining that month’s distinctive Gorgonic spirit. In 1963 Kožarić produced Proclamation (fig. 4), an invitation to artists to take collective action: “Sculptors of the world, let’s make a cast of the terrestrial globe!” To initiate this mapping process, Kožarić took a cast of a section of his own yard. His aim, as he put it, was not to conform to nature, but to enlist “the invention, the thinking up, of a new nature.”7 In their pursuit of antiart forms, Gorgona artists brought to the scene new artistic practices that disturbed the conventions of socialist modernism.
By the mid-1960s the first waves of Conceptual art had hit Yugoslavia’s artistic centers. The Ljubljana-based OHO group, active from 1966 to 1971—whose name is a synthesis of two Slovene words, oko (eye) and uho (ear)—employed distinct intermedia strategies, including concrete poetry, experimental film, performance art, and particular forms of Arte Povera and land art. Iztok Geister and Marko Pogačnik, the group’s leading theorists, advanced concepts of reism (from the Latin noun res, meaning “thing”), a complex philosophical and aesthetic system based in “a return to things themselves.”

Reists maintained that only things exist, and they advocated the need to consciously observe the world in all its minute detail. The OHO artists collected objects of the same type, such as bottles or knives, with the aim of identifying not only the objects’ generic characteristics but also their specific differences. Art historian Igor Zabel has written that OHO artists made use of provocation “as a way to point out the differences” hidden behind the “horizon of expectations.” Language—as means of coaxing “the inaudible voice from the object”—and topographic poetry played a significant role in the group’s practice. Poetry was treated not as a medium through which the reader grappled with meaning but as autonomous material (in the form of wallpaper covered with typographic signs, for instance). The OHO artists gained international visibility when they participated in the 1970 exhibition Information at The Museum of Modern Art, New York. A few months later, in a defiant gesture against institutionalization, they announced the group’s dissolution.

The Yugoslavian Neo-Avant-Garde, 1968–80

In 1968, with anarcho-syndicalist and student uprisings flaring across Europe, not least in the universities of socialist Yugoslavia, artists broke free from mainstream institutional settings, expanding art into political life and praxis. This kind of alternative art was known as the New Art Practice, and its arrival signaled the peak of neo-avant-garde activities.

Beginning in the 1970s, artists began relocating their work to public venues, or to student centers, which served as platforms for ideas that were largely informed by neo-Marxist critical theory. The eruptive force of 1968 was due in part to protagonists in Zagreb, Split, Belgrade, Novi Sad, and Ljubljana, among them the artist group Red Peristyle (Creveni Peristil), which carried out rebellious actions, such as painting red the large public square in front of Diocletian’s Palace in Split in January 1968, using brooms and eight gallons of lead paint. The action, considered an illegal attack on public property, provoked controversy and arrests; the government denounced it as a crime against communism, and two participants, Pavao Dulčić and Toma Čaleta, later committed suicide. Red Peristyle’s action had echoes in other cities as well. In 1970 a group of art students organized the action Total Event at the Student Center, Zagreb, whose director was the leading avant-garde theorist and art critic Željko Košćević. In connection with this action they proclaimed “The Decree on Democratization of Art,” stating, “1) The following are hereby abolished: painting, sculpture, graphic art, applied arts, industrial design, architecture and...
urban planning; 2) A ban is hereby placed on the following: all activity in the history of art and especially so-called art criticism; 3) There shall be no exhibitions in galleries, museums or art pavilions.”12 Similar positions against the academic discipline of art history and conformist art institutions was seen throughout the 1970s Yugoslavian cultural scene.

Fig. 5. Goran Trbuljak. “I do not wish to show anything new and original.” Halftone print, 23 7/16 x 16 1/2” (59.5 x 41.9 cm)

This institutional critique aimed to expose, in addition to the mechanisms defining the artwork’s market value, the prescribed positions of artist and spectator in the art system, as did Goran Trbuljak, who in 1971 showed his work at the Student Center in an exhibition consisting of a single poster on which was written the statement “I do not wish to show anything new and original” (fig. 5). With this personal declaration, Trbuljak announced his indifference to issues of authorship, thus offering, according to curator Marko Golub, “a standpoint typical of conceptual art that attempts to deconstruct the modernist concept of originality, i.e. the idea of the artist who creates unrepeatable works.”13 A year later Trbuljak abolished distinctions between artist and spectator with a referendum in which the public was invited to decide whether or not he was an artist. Also in 1970 Braco Dimitrijević began a multiyear project titled Casual Passersby I Met At (fig. 6), which consisted of oversize photographic portraits of anonymous people displayed on billboards around the city and in public squares previously reserved for images of Marshal Tito and high-ranked party officials—a gesture intended to debunk the state’s strategy of persuasion and its enduring image of authority.
The structuralist filmmaker and actionist Tomislav Gotovac looked not to politics, which he considered dead, but to art as the vehicle for change. He marched naked in public spaces in an attempt to provoke a state built on mass docility, asserting his difference amid hard-line social conformity. He ridiculed all positions of power and “all those who serve the power, regardless of political and social systems.” Along with his actions, Gotovac made experimental films and, in 1964, inaugurated the golden age of Yugoslav underground cinema with three works—Straight Line (Stevens-Duke), Blue Rider (Godard-Art), and Circle (Jutkevitch-Count)—made at the Academic Film Center (AFC) in Belgrade. Often compared to Peter Kubelka, Michael Snow, and Hollis Frampton, Gotovac aimed to free viewers from automated perception. He sought a synthesis of film and real life, as demonstrated by his famous statement, “When I open my eyes in the morning, I see a film.”
Filmmakers of the Black Wave (Crni talas) movement likewise produced films at the AFC and other amateurs' clubs, including Kino Klub Belgrade. Influenced by filmmakers of the American underground (especially Andy Warhol) and the French New Wave (Jean-Luc Godard, Chris Marker), Black Wave directors Želimir Žilnik, Kokan Rakonjac, Živojin Pavlović, and Dušan Makavejev conceived feature films and documentaries that were considered revisionist and dissident. The movement's wunderkind and main proponent was Žilnik. His first feature film, 

*Early Works* (*Rani radovi*, 1969), offers a daring perspective on the 1968 student demonstrations against the red bourgeoisie, or bureaucrats of the Yugoslavian state. Although censored in Yugoslavia, the film became an instant success when, in 1969, it was screened in New York at MoMA and received the Golden Bear award at the Berlin Film Festival. Žilnik’s best-known documentary is *Black Film* (*Crni film*, 1971), an unflinching critique of the social inequities in Yugoslavia. The film is about a group of destitute people whom Žilnik invites to stay at his home with his wife and child for several days while he conducts interviews with passersby on the streets of Belgrade, discussing socialist indifference toward the homeless. Heavily criticized by the government, *Black Film* was blacklisted in 1973, when the Communist Party declared all Black Wave authors enemies of the state.

Equally notorious for its stance against official culture was the Group of Six Artists (Grupa šestorice autora). Formed in the mid-1970s by Vlado Martek, Mladen Stilinović, Sven Stilinović, Željko Jerman, Boris Demur, and Fedor Vučemilović, the group staged exhibition-actions in public squares (fig. 7), alongside roads, at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb, and at a community beach on the Sava River. The artists also published *May ’75* (1978–84), a magazine named after the date of their
first exhibition-action. In texts and slogans reading, “The Little Red Book,” “Poetry Should Be Fucked,” and “False Poetry,” Martek attacked the state and its stultified cultural system. Mladen Stilinović demystified the color red in a number of antisocialist works; he also celebrated laziness in *Artist at Work* (*Umjetnik radi*, 1978; fig. 8), a sequence of photographs showing the artist asleep. The group made creative use of nonproduction by withdrawing from a system that they felt had stifled human potential. They sabotaged the government by selling money for half its value, painting the Yugoslavian flag in monochrome, and circulating samizdat publications with the catchphrase “State, I shall disfigure you with art.” After three years of activity, the Group of Six Artists moved their activities to Podroom (or “cellar”), founded in 1978 by Iveković and Dalibor Martinis, which was the first artist-run space to be independent of institutional and market forces (fig. 9).
Despite the revolutionary tendencies of the New Art Practice, traditional gender roles were unchanged. Iveković has pointed out that “the proponents of the New Art Practice in socialist Yugoslavia were mostly male artists; in the 1970s only a few women artists were visible on the scene”; on her preoccupation with the question of feminism in society, she noted, “I tried to reflect on my own position as a woman in a patriarchal culture, which was, in spite of officially egalitarian policy, always alive and present in socialism.” 18 Within the framework of the New Art Practice, Iveković is a rare example of a woman working in collaborative partnership with male colleagues, even while, as curator Ivana Bago has explained, “[remaining] the only artist to truly and consistently deal with feminist agendas, questioning and subverting the hegemonic codification of gender … and, through her work, constructing the paradigm of woman as the political subject.” 19 In the 1970s Iveković engaged with the rituals of identity-making in picture-story series such as Double Life (Dvostruki život, plates 40–60) and Tragedy of a Venus (Tragedija jedne Venere, plates 24–39); photomontages including Diary (Dnevnik, plates 61–67), Eight Tears (Osam suza, plates 79–86), Structure (Struktura, plates 68–78), Sweet Life (Slatki život, figs. 10 and 11), Bitter Life (Gorki život, figs. 12 and 13), Paper Women (plates 92–101), and My Scar. My Signature (Girls) (Moj ožiljak–moj potpis [djevojke], plates 87 and 88); videotaped self-portraits such as Instructions No. 1 (Instrukcije br. 1, plates 8–15) and Make Up—Make Down (plates 16–23); and performances such as Un Jour violente (page 81, fig. 1), and Triangle (Trokut, plates 103–7), this last among her
most radical feminist responses to hegemonic power structures. Through such pioneering works, Iveković explored the gendered stereotypes disseminated through the popular media (magazines, films, television) and their effects on women.

Although there was no organized women’s rights movement in Yugoslavia, a number of feminist sociologists and art historians such as Dunja Blažević, Bojana Pejić, Rada Iveković, Nada Ler-Sofronić, Žarana Papić, Lidija Sklevicky, Slavenka Drakulić, and Vesna Kesić began to address feminist issues more systematically in the early 1970s. Blažević, influenced by feminist theory, organized in 1972 the first April Meetings (Aprilski susreti) and also served as director of the Student Cultural Center (SKC) in Belgrade. The SKC was affiliated with the University of Belgrade and was housed in a building that had previously been used by the communist secret police. The opening of student cultural centers in Belgrade, Zagreb, and Novi Sad was viewed by many as a concession made by the communist elite—a way to allow the youth to play at revolution—after the failed student riots of 1968. The centers, however, acquired a dynamic and radical character, with artists subverting the mission of a state-controlled art institution by creating some of the most forward-thinking work in the region. In 1978, for instance, Iveković staged breakthrough interactive performances with the public: in the performance-installation Between Us (Inter Nos), she connected two rooms with a silent closed-circuit television system and engaged one participant at a time in an intimate exchange of gestures mediated by the screen; in First Belgrade Performance (1. beogradski performans) she entered the gallery accompanied by the curator and then walked in circles to the rhythm of a song playing overhead, gradually diminishing the distance between herself and the audience until she was close enough to shake hands and converse with each person individually. In these late-1970s performances Iveković analyzed various feminist art practices in works that relied on social relationality.

Also in 1978 the SKC in Belgrade organized “Drugarica Žena. Žensko pitanje—novi pristup?” (Comraddess woman: the women’s question—a new approach?, fig. 14), a two-day feminist conference. It was the first of its kind in a communist country.
and brought together feminists from both Western and East-Central Europe, yet it was heavily criticized by the official Yugoslavian women’s organizations. As Pejić has noted, their criticism was based “on the claim that a feminist stance was superfluous in our [communist] society, which had already ‘overcome’ gender differences in the Revolution.” Furthermore, she has explained, “they saw the ‘new approach’ as an ‘import’ from the (capitalist) West.” Still, the event marked a turning point. For the first time Yugoslavian feminists were able to publicly question the rule of patriarchy in socialist society. That same year the association Woman and Society (Žena i društvo) was formed at the University of Zagreb. Iveković attended their seminars; in the next decade her commitment to gender and feminist issues expanded to include sexual power relations and effects of violence on women in society.

Radical Art and the Disintegration of Yugoslavia, 1980–90

The 1980s were bracketed by major political events: Marshal Tito’s death on May 4, 1980, and the dismantling of the Berlin Wall on November 9, 1989. This period was marked by ethnic strife and nationalist disequilibrium. It was a time when the “Yugoslav experiment,” the country’s idiosyncratic ideology previously held together by the state’s commanding leader, met its demise. The resulting rise of nationalism led to constitutional crisis: Slovenia and Croatia demanded looser ties with the Yugoslavian federation, Kosovo sought the status of an independent republic, and Serbia pursued absolute sovereignty over Yugoslavia. Following a coup d’état in 1989, Slobodan Milošević became chairman of the central committee of the League of Communists of Serbia. His inflammatory politics led to ethnic frictions in Kosovo and Bosnia-Herzegovina,

Fig. 14. Attendees at “Drugarica Žena. Žensko pitanje—novi pristup?”
(Comradess woman: the women’s question—a new approach?), Belgrade, October 1978
straining the country’s sociopolitical fabric. By the end of the decade, nationalist sentiment was felt among every member of the federation.

As Yugoslavia disintegrated, artists lost no time in radically deconstructing the modernist aesthetic, socialist realism, and symbolic systems of totalitarian ideology. In the politically unstable post-Tito Yugoslavia, various art practices and subcultural movements and scenes emerged, including new-wave music, media, and performance. An eclectic and provocative atmosphere prone to artistic experimentation arose in Belgrade, Ljubljana, Sarajevo, and Zagreb. Post-Conceptual artist Goran Đorđević began developing a political system of art and culture that questioned the canonized foundations of modern art. He gave lectures under the names of famous literary critics and philosophers, such as Walter Benjamin, and made copies of his childhood paintings and works from the history of modernism, primarily the Suprematist paintings of Kazimir Malevich (Đorđević was known as Belgrade Malevich). Raša Todosijević
directed his critical views into sarcastic paintings, sculptural installations, performances, and pseudoadvertisements, with which he denounced the dominant Serbian culture of exalted nationalism.

The ironic appropriation of the nationalistic project has also been a core practice of the multimedia art collective Neue Slowenische Kunst (NSK, fig. 15). Formed in 1984 in Ljubljana, NSK comprises several groups that share a similar style of expression in different mediums: the punk-rock band Laibach (the German name for Ljubljana), the visual-arts group IRWIN, the graphic design group New Collectivism, the “retro-garde” Red Pilot Cosmokinetic Theater (formerly called the Scipion Našice Sisters Theater troupe), the film and video group Retrovision, and the Department of Pure and Applied Philosophy, which serves as NSK’s theoretical arm. NSK exposes the inadequacies of totalitarian ideology by overidentifying with it, such as Laibach’s adoption and reenactment of totalitarian ritual in its performances. Laibach stirred public rage by bringing references to fascism into their concerts, including flags, horns, and background film projections that evoked memories of the Nazi occupation of Slovenia during World War II, or by using symbols created by IRWIN to recall Soviet art traditions. Piotrowski has argued that this strategy allowed viewers “to confront traumas created by the reality of the past, memory and history”; he has added that NSK “aimed not just at undermining the power of the communist symbols by the use of irony and satire, but, and above all, at directing our attention to the fact that those symbols held power over the people submitted to that power.”

Or, as art historian Marina Gržinić has put it, NSK denaturalized “the previously ‘naturalized’ socialist cultural values and rituals.” In 1991, while Yugoslavia was at war, NSK tackled the issue of ethnic problems and border claims by creating the NSK State in Time, a utopian state made up of mobile citizens and predicated on the idea of statehood without territory. The group has issued passports, flags, and postage stamps and has staged shows of their work in the guise of an embassy. In exploring the problematic issues of closed frontiers, the NSK State in Time reveals the nationalism haunting the former Yugoslavia and how that nationalism led to new borders for countries excluded from the European Union.

Iveković’s most commanding works of the 1980s train a critical lens on various aspects of state power. Such is the case with Personal Cuts (Osobni rezovi, 1982; plates 119–28), a single-channel video in which she constructs a narrative that counters the official history of socialism using cinema vérité techniques, reportage, and precise edits: scenes about the history of Yugoslavia, which she recorded directly from state television, alternate with images of the artist cutting into a stocking pulled over her face. In this work Iveković at once reveals repressive features of the totalitarian past and deconstructs the politics of viewing. That same year she distinctively combined issues of political power with those of woman’s role in society in her performance Practice Makes a Master (Übung macht den Meister, plates 140–48), in which the covering of a woman’s head with a plastic bag serves as powerful metaphor for political acts of violence. In a space that art critic Tom Holert has
described as “[merging] classroom, rehearsal stage, interrogation cell, and torture chamber,” the woman repeatedly practices falling and standing up as a blinding lamp is methodically switched on and off every few seconds. Here Iveković intertwines the histories of feminism and violence into a type of narrative that would become, in the next decade—a period informed as much by her experience as a woman living under the siege of war as by her duty as a citizen responsible for society’s actions—central to her practice.

Antiwar Art During the Yugoslav Wars, 1990–2000

In 1989, with the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the communist regime in the Soviet Union, the Cold War era officially ended. Yet in Yugoslavia instead of peace and democracy, signs of a post–Cold War fever were manifested in acts of irrational violence. The country began to fragment into an increasingly loose federal structure. Nationalist ideology supplanted communist rule. Serbian uprisings in Croatia began to occur as early as August 1990, nearly a year before Croatian leadership made any move toward independence. Then, on June 25, 1991, Slovenia and Croatia unilaterally declared their independence. The next day, the Serb-controlled Yugoslav National Army sent tanks and helicopters crashing across the Croatian-Slovene border. After a brief military conflict with the Slovene militia, the army withdrew, allowing the Slovenes to secede, but in Croatia the war escalated and did not come to an end until 1995. In April 1992 Bosnian Serb forces seized control of territories in Bosnia as a step toward a possible union with Serbia. This was a period of ethnic cleansing, rape, and concentration camps for Muslim citizens, where many died, with civil war in Bosnia reaching a peak in the summer of 1995. Clashes between the Serbian state and the Albanian population of Kosovo took place in 1999, leading to the eventual intervention by NATO and the United States. Forty-five years of communist Yugoslavia ended in enmity and partition.

In Croatia the antiwar campaign started around 1991 in alternative media outlets including, at the forefront, Arkzin, a publication that offered a model of participatory artistic production and political activism. “At a time when the young country’s control over the traditional media infringed on civil liberties,” curator Jasna Jakšić has written, the circle of activists associated with Arkzin, “arguing for free access to the Internet, established networks and non-hierarchical structures that would allow the independent cultural scene in Zagreb to be modifiable, flexible, and sustainable.” In 1996 Arkzin protested against the shutdown of Croatian Radio 101, which, together with B92 in Belgrade and Radio Študent in Ljubljana, pioneered media independence in the region, voicing resistance against the war and finding new means of cultural action to reach a wider public and exert an impact on society. Despite its small circulation, Arkzin served as a major clearinghouse for various human-rights actions and nonviolent conflict resolutions.

During this period, several artists produced poignant works in response to traumatic events. Iveković was at the forefront of
activist resistance, and her practice acquired a sense of increased agency. In response to the mass rape of women in prison camps, she conceived the video installation *Frozen Images* (1992), in which a life-size image of a naked woman is projected onto a chilling bed of ice; she examined the taboo subject of “humanitarian” aid offered to war victims in *Mind over Matter* (1993, fig. 16), a work consisting of a large pile of colorful clothing from a local Caritas or Red Cross organization displayed before a screen showing documentary footage, in extreme slow motion, of former soldier patients receiving electroshock therapy in American hospitals in the late 1950s; and she addressed the plight of Muslim war refugees in Croatia and Bosnia in *Resnik* (1994, plates 154–58), an installation featuring an abundance of human-scale live plants and a video projection of short visual poems mixed with images of a wasteland.

Iveković also addressed a woman’s resilience in the face of ethnic wars in *My Name Is Nermina Zildžo* (1995–2002), a project focused on the life of the eponymous art historian. The point of departure for this piece was an interview that the artist conducted with Zildžo after Zildžo had left the besieged city of Sarajevo to attend a conference in Paris. The project had two incarnations. For the first, made for the 2002 exhibition *Home* at the Sarajevo Center for Contemporary Art, Iveković offered Zildžo a room, set up within the exhibition space, that served as an editing studio. Here Zildžo viewed the interview for the first time, marking, at the artist’s invitation, the segments she did not want to show publicly. For the second part of the project, conceived the same year for the show *Here Tomorrow* at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Zagreb, Iveković created, in an abandoned flour mill, an installation featuring a quote from Zildžo in a French magazine article titled “Sarajevo à bout de souffle” (Sarajevo breathless): “We are simulating life....The entire city


simulates life. We are breathless”; Iveković’s own General Alert (Godard) (Opća opasnost [Godard], 1995; fig. 17), a video work consisting of an extract from Jean-Luc Godard’s À bout de souffle (Breathless, 1960), recorded on Croatian television as missiles were launched over two cities, with the caption “OPĆA OPASNOST U VALPOVU I BELIŠĆU” (General alert for Valpovo and Belišće) running across the screen; and a display of books and exhibition catalogues about artists born in the former Yugoslavia.26 Visitors were asked to mark the publications with different colored Post-it notes to indicate those they would save and those they would burn to keep themselves warm if they found themselves under attack during the winter, as Zildžo did. Rather than providing a coherent view of reality, Iveković’s project made use of a disjunctive strategy to depict the ravaging and irrational state of war.

Issues of survival during wartime are also central to Slaven Tolj’s performances. In 1993, during his first leave from the Croatian army, Tolj undertook an action of commemorative impact. In observation of a national mourning custom, he removed twelve layers of clothing that he had worn on the battleground and sewed one black button on the first layer, two on the second, three on the third, and so on. The last layer was a sailor jacket; Tolj tore a button from it and sewed it directly to his skin, expressing feelings of grief in the face of absurd warfare. In 1993 Tolj and his wife, Marija Grazio, enacted Food for Survival (fig. 18), a performance in which they undressed from the
waist up and applied an unidentified powder to their bodies from a can labeled Überlebensnahrung (food for survival), which had been sent by Western Allies as aid to war-torn Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina; they proceeded to lick each other, as if to feed themselves, in a ritual suggestive of the enforced erasure of erotic drives.

In direct response to the devastating wars, Marina Abramović, who left Yugoslavia in 1976 to live in the West, created Balkan Baroque (1997). In this poignant performance-installation, Abramović cleans heaps of butchered animal bones in front of a triple-channel video projection. On the middle screen, she appears life-size in a white lab coat, delivering a pseudoscientific lecture on the training of wolf rats in the Balkans (a metaphor for a Yugoslavia in ruins). Toward the end of the lecture, she takes off her coat and, switching roles, starts dancing wildly to the tune of a Balkan folk song, as if urged to express her baroque sensibility. Projected onto screens to the left and right are video portraits of Abramović’s mother and father. In one scene her father, a former general under Marshal Tito, holds a pistol in his hand while her mother, a partisan fighter and later director of the National Museum of Art and Revolution in Belgrade, raises her hands in fear. Confronting real events with
the theatrical and mixing prerecorded and live performances, Abramović invokes in *Balkan Baroque* the seventeenth-century *Trauerspiel* (literally “mourning-play”), a form of Baroque theatrical tragedy conceived during the Thirty Years’ War, which began in 1618. The *Trauerspiel* reflects on the era in which it originated (as distinct from *Tragödie*, or classical tragedy), rooted as it is in contemporary politics rather than myth, and expresses the playlike nature of life itself and the endlessness of historical catastrophe. Pejić, in a discussion of the *Trauerspiel* as described by the literary critic Walter Benjamin in *The Origin of German Tragic Drama* (1924), has explained that such plays “were often said ‘to have been written by animals for animals.’” Yet, she has continued, “Benjamin says that to the contemporaries, people living in the seventeenth century, these plays looked ‘completely natural, because they reflected the image of their own lives’.” Taking up this tradition, *Balkan Baroque* lends itself to an allegorical interpretation of the cruelty and lunacy of civil war in Yugoslavia.

During this period Milica Tomić created powerful works that ponder the relationship between violent, dramatic ethnic cleansing and national identity. In her video *I Am Milica Tomić* (1998–99, fig. 19), she examines the ties that link her identity as an individual to the political identity of her Serbian nation by reciting, in more than thirty languages, lines that are at once true and false: “I am Milica Tomić, I am Dutch,” “I am Milica Tomić, I am Catalan,” “I am Milica Tomić, I am Norwegian.” For each new identity she adopts, Tomić suffers a bloody wound on her body. Through the double-binding act of at once asserting and denying identity, Tomić exposes the specter of nationalism and violent conflicts that has haunted her country.

With the historic turn to post-Yugoslavian states, Todosijević also began, in 1989, a series of installations titled *Gott liebt die Serben* (God loves the Serbs). In these works, he inverted symbols of totalitarian ideologies and religions—arranging ordinary restaurant tables in the shape of a swastika on which traditional Serbian dishes (beans, bread, and beer) were served, or mounting a giant red swastika on a wall with a text underneath it written in heavy black typeface about a Serbian.
woman who curses God and communism alike—to offer an enduring political critique of the right-wing, ultranationalist daily culture that pervaded the region throughout the 1990s.

Art and the Postcommunist Condition in the Democratic State of Croatia, 2000 to Today

Throughout the former Yugoslavia a return to conservative values marked the end of the 1990s—a decade during which, in Bago’s words, “nationalism was legitimized and celebrated” and “the ancient division of male and female agency” was brought to the fore.29 In Croatia, however, the political paradigm changed with the election of the Social Democrats in 2000. In its eagerness to embrace liberal democracy, the postcommunist state quickly transformed itself into a consumerist society with no recollection of its past. To counter this shift, artists concerned with the question of historical memory devised discursive art practices built on interactivity with the public, collective authorship, and collaborative initiatives intended to broaden the focus of newly formed societies. The most progressive of the Croatian contemporary artists of the new millennium recognized the significance of activist practices initiated by major figures of the neo-avant-garde, such as Iveković, Gotovac, and the Group of Six Artists, thus demonstrating a renewed desire to act and take responsibility (or to develop “response-ability,” or “the ability to respond”) when facing social issues.30

Igor Grubić, for instance, has noted that “Sanja Iveković, Vlado Martek and Mladen Stilinović are the artists that in the eighties left a permanent mark on my approach to art. I was interested in them because of the ways their works reacted to social actualities, because of their direct approach to reality, the consistency of their work, but also, very importantly, the width of their creativity and the ethics present in their lives and works.”31 In 1998 Grubić staged an illegal action in Split titled Black Peristyle (Crni peristil), painting the public court of Diocletian’s Palace black in homage to Red Peristyle’s 1968 action. The same year, in collaboration with ATTACK! (Autonomous Culture Factory!), he organized Book and Society—22% (Knjiga i društvo—22%), a one-day, forty-artist action in protest against a new twenty-two percent tax on books, which, in the context of the postwar economic crisis, would have drastically reduced the opportunity for ordinary people to buy literature. Publishers and writers also voiced their opposition, but the tax was finally levied. In 2000, for his exhibition at SKC in Zagreb, Grubić produced a leaflet calling for an overturning of the center’s management due to its reactionary politics in the 1990s, during Franjo Tuđman’s presidency.

David Maljković reexamined national history and its artistic heritage in terms of its future rather than its past in his epic video trilogy Scene for a New Heritage (2002–06). Set between 2045 and 2071, the works focus on a communist monument that artist Vojin Bakić designed in 1981 in memory of the Yugoslavian victims of World War II in Petrova Gora. The monument, which all schoolchildren were required to see during the communist era, was severely damaged in the war of the 1990s, and today

31. Igor Grubić, interviewed by Maja Gujinović, Jakšić, and Srđan Laterza, in Dovč et al., From Consideration to Commitment, pp. 377–78.
it exists as a structure without function. In Maljković’s videos, visitors to the memorial ask themselves rhetorical questions about the abandoned site; their dialogue is sung in what sounds like an alien language but is in fact a Croatian folk idiom. The trilogy travels through time to show the artist’s vision of how the meanings of history and monuments change from one era to the next.

Artists including Ivana Keser and Aleksandar Battista Ilić skirted entrenched power structures and the capitalist market by forming, in 2001, the Community Art and Theory School (fig. 20)—a platform for free-form public discussions, lectures, film projections, performances, and workshops on activism and poststudio artistic practices. Keser published her own newspaper and organized radio and Internet forums, which were publicly accessible and free to use. Starting in 1995 she and Ilić led, in collaboration with Gotovac, a series of Sunday walks in the mountains near Zagreb, an idyllic area, though one troubled by the recent history of violent wars. Ilić documented the group’s walks by taking thousands of slides with an Instamatic camera, and she titled the project Weekend Art: Hallelujah the Hill (1995–2005, fig. 21) in honor of the Lithuanian avant-garde film director Adolfas Mekas, who in 1963 made Hallelujah the Hills, a landmark of New American Cinema. Informed by independent cinema, the cross-generational trio produced, as curator Nada Beroš has written, “a critique of and flight from a transitional society in which artists necessarily have to turn the traditional time of rest—Sunday—into work” in order to speak “in ‘beautiful images’ about the depression of the postcommunist condition in Croatia.”


Fig. 21. Ivana Keser. Weekend Art Newspaper: Hallelujah the Hill. 1999. Newsprint, 16 9/16 x 11 11/16” (42.1 x 29.7 cm). The Museum of Modern Art, New York. Gift of the artist

Working in the interstices of disciplines conventionally defined as science, politics, and art, and using new media to engage extensively with audiences, Andreja Kulunčić has also created new models of sociability and communication. In *Distributive Justice* (2001–05), she looked at the question of justice in the distribution of common goods. Designed as a social laboratory, the interdisciplinary project involved research materials, polls, surveys, interviews, scientific workshops, interactive web-based games, and audiovisual recordings. Participants were able to voice their views on a range of social questions, such as, “Is it possible to create a just society?” “Are there ways for a democratic division of wealth?” and “Is there an alternative to capitalism?” In 2002, for Manifesta 4 in Frankfurt, Kulunčić developed *Artists from …* (figs. 22 and 23), a project consisting of billboards displayed around the city, each portraying an artist in the exhibition with information about his or her income along with the average salary made by the middle class in the country in which that artist was based. Intended as a visual survey, the project reflected the discrepancies between Western and postcommunist Eastern European incomes, the uneven distribution of capital, and the social position of the artist in the global context.

In addressing broader social issues determined by the flux of market economy, Kulunčić’s projects are informed by precedents such as Iveković’s *Nada Dimić File* (2000–01), in which the artist exposed the state’s lost status as a “guarantor of a system based on a notion of solidarity between workers.”33 *Nada Dimić File* makes reference to a socialist textile factory named for Nada Dimić, a national heroine who was killed in World War II.
for her antifascist activities. The factory functioned successfully throughout the communist period and was privatized and renamed Endi International in the 1990s; it went bankrupt in the late 1990s, resulting in the loss of hundreds of jobs for women. Iveković addressed these events with a series of socially engaged projects, including free legal advice for the factory’s female employees; printed matter in the form of leaflets and T-shirts; an installation of historical books that includes information about Dimić’s life, the items produced in the factory, a model of the building, and newspaper articles about the transformation of the factory; and an urban intervention in which the neon “Nada Dimić” sign on the factory’s facade was relit.

In her work since 2000 Iveković has addressed the neoliberal capitalist state’s indifference to social issues and its overall sense of collective amnesia, especially with regard to its socialist past and antifascist heritage. Gen XX (1997–2001, plates 172–78), a project rooted in feminist and political concerns, is particularly relevant to the broader context of Croatian past and present history. Gen XX is a series of textual inserts on fashion ads featuring famous models, introducing the models by the names of heroines who fought against fascism during World War II but who have been largely forgotten. Iveković hoped to disseminate the work in commercial magazines, but only Arkzin would publish the complete series, which links capitalist marketing, media events, and the fashion industry—with their insistence on the “now”—to mechanisms that threaten to erase the whole socialist era. Gender theorist Orly Lubin has argued that, by bringing the names and stories of these young partisans into visibility, Iveković taps distinct facets of feminine representation, such as “body and face, name and history, biography and sight, both an object for the gaze and a subject gazing out of context, out of the void, defiantly, always still occupying the space allocated to her: the cover of a magazine.”34 Yet here, Lubin has added, “this cover is used for political critique.” In Women’s House (Sunglasses) (Ženska kuća [sunčane naočale], 2002–present; plates 179–87) Iveković presents domestic violence as the suppressed side of both contemporary Western democracies and countries in transition. The artist appropriated ads for designer sunglasses (a reference to “the use of dark glasses to hide bruises”), and supplanted their logos with the stories of battered women.35 Distributing the work as posters, postcards, and magazine advertisements across several continents, Iveković brought the burning issue of violence against women to light.

In 2001 Iveković realized one of the most significant public projects of the new millennium, Lady Rosa of Luxembourg (plates 167–71)—an exact replica of Luxembourg’s national monument Gëlle Fra (Golden lady), which was erected in the 1920s to commemorate the victims of World War I, destroyed during the Nazi occupation of World War II, and rebuilt in the 1980s. Probing the past from the critical perspective of present-day feminism, Iveković made three interventions to her replica of Gëlle Fra: she changed the name of the female figure standing atop the obelisk from Nike (the allegorical figure of victory) to Rosa Luxemburg (the political revolutionary); she made the figure not only historically but also physically

pregnant; and she modified the dedication at the base of the obelisk to address women's identity issues. Fusing historical inquiry with gender politics, *Lady Rosa of Luxembourg* adopts a generative approach to historical memory. This enormously controversial monument became the topic of national debates, television and print news coverage, cabaret shows, and public forums (fig. 24).

Fig. 24. Article responding to *Lady Rosa of Luxembourg* in Tageblatt, December 29, 2001

A year later, for Documenta 11, Iveković created *Searching for My Mother’s Number* (*Tražim majčin broj*), figs. 25–28, a multimedia research center focused on looking for missing facts about her mother, the partisan fighter Nera Šafarić, who was taken to Auschwitz during World War II and whose story had been all but forgotten. If the Third Reich waged an obsessive war against memory, then Iveković’s project reverses the process of forgetting, opening up a space for knowledge about and reflection on human freedom and women’s rights. Curators Nataša Ilić and Kathrin Rhomberg have proposed that by engaging in such a reconstruction, Iveković foregrounds her mother’s political struggle “as a case study that shows a relevance to our present time.” Drawing on a four-decade-long analysis of the mass media, feminism, and politics, the artist delves into issues of women’s rights within the forces that shape a nation’s identity, and does so with a fearless, radical criticality toward the communist past and the capitalist future.
It is hard to strangle someone with your bare hands. Unless you were a psychopath, a trained assassin, or carried away with rage, you would probably be sick before you could accomplish the act, as the physical inhibitions on killing another of one’s kind came into play. Having someone vomit over you is not pleasant, but it is a considerable improvement on being strangled. Shooting someone, however, is a good deal easier. Killing at a distance by using a weapon overrides our sensory inhibitions much more effectively than strangling or stabbing. We can put up with using torture if we do not have to listen to the screams.

This is one of several reasons why civilization breeds violence. Everything that we count as part of civilization—television, sanitation, opera, insurance companies—is an extension of our bodies. The human body, because it is capable of labor and complex communication, is also capable of overriding its own limits. It produces institutions that extend far beyond it, making our flesh seem pathetically puny by contrast. This, however, means losing sensory control of what we fashion, opening up a gap in which violence and alienation may germinate. We are continually at risk of being overwhelmed by the world we create, falling under the imperious sway of our own products as in the Frankenstein myth.

This is not true of squirrels and badgers. Squirrels and badgers organize a world for themselves that does not stretch much beyond their bodies. As far as we know, they are not busily at work constructing nuclear missiles, unless they are being remarkably furtive about it. It is not only that they do not have the paws for it but that they do not have the conceptual equipment that language brings with it. The world they inhabit is responsive to their physical control, and thus is unlikely to get out of hand.

The linguistic animal, by contrast, is constantly in danger of overreaching itself and bringing itself to nothing. Its perilous powers are sacred in the traditional double meaning of the term, both blessed and cursed, world making and fearfully destructive. This is why the ancient Greeks believed we had to grope our way vigilantly in the darkness of this world, hedged round with an impenetrable thicket of taboos and prohibitions, continually in danger of coming to grief by transgressing some law of kinship or religious duty. Tragedy, which the ancient Greeks invented, is
the form appropriate to the hubristic animal. We are perpetually at risk of undoing ourselves, and this peril is enhanced by the fact that we are social animals as well. Labor and language are the marks of a sociable creature who cannot survive without his or her fellows. Our lives are intricately interdependent, which was something else the ancient Greeks understood. For them, one meaning of the word “monster” was a creature who was entirely self-dependent. They knew, as the modern epoch on the whole does not, that whatever precarious degree of autonomy human beings can negotiate for themselves exists within a deeper mutual dependency.

This, however, is part of our disaster as well as of our delight. Our lives are interwoven with one another far more subtly and invisibly than we can ever know, which means among other things that our slightest actions breed consequences in the lives of others of which we cannot be aware. Free actions, once performed, slip from our grasp and confront others in the guise of nameless fatalities. They might even come in time to confront us ourselves in just as alien, anonymous a form as in the Oedipus legend. Freedom and fatality are thus sides of the same coin. We struggle within a web of anonymous actions, and the effects of such actions, which none of us can master as a whole yet for which we are all obscurely responsible. This is one source of the Christian doctrine of original sin—a sin that we as individuals never committed but for which we remain ineluctably stained with guilt. So-called free actions are tainted at root, since in the complex mesh of human society they can easily result in violence and oppression for others. Market societies, in which the flourishing of a few individuals may mean a thousand others going to the wall, is a modern version of this contradiction.

Even so, the Christian belief is that the Fall is a fortunate one (felix culpa). It is fortunate because the powers that allow us to plunder and violate also allow us to create and communicate. Animals who work on their environments primarily with their bodies do not have a history. It is because human beings can shape their own destinies through language and labor that we are historical creatures, continually able to project ourselves beyond the narrow sensory round of the present into a future that goes beyond it. We differ from other animals in being able to torture, but also in being able to transcend. The Fall was a fall up into culture and civilization, not a lapse down to the level of the beasts. The existence of a beast, were it not for the human predator, is secure but uneventful; the life of the linguistic animal is exhilarating but sickeningly unstable. An animal chained to meaning is continually at risk, and the deepest danger it faces is itself. No other species could possibly prey on it as malevolently as it does on itself. Moreover, if Sigmund Freud is to be credited, the final obscenity is that it actually reaps pleasure from the process of its own self-dissolution. It is not only predatory but perverse.

There is, then, an anthropology of violence as well as a sociology of it. If we were bodiless beings like angels, torture and war would be impossible. Yet they would also be out of the question if we were purely bodily creatures, since then we would share in the blessed, monotonous state of those animals who cannot
build concentration camps in Yugoslavia or produce a fire storm over Dresden because they cannot write poetry either. It is the fact that we are cusped so awkwardly between bodiliness and advanced consciousness, or as some earlier thinkers might have put it between beast and angel, that we are such problematic beings.

Power can destroy the human body, but it can also harness it to its own ends. It can succeed in enlisting its affections, so that we come to be half in love with the very forces that repress us. This, indeed, is the only durable and effective form of power there is. A political state that secures its authority through coercion, ready at any moment to unleash violence on its citizens, is unlikely to prosper. For one thing, a cowed citizenry is not likely to be a cooperative one; for another thing, state violence will tend sooner or later to provoke rebellion. Regimes that govern through the tank and torture chamber can survive for some considerable time (think of South Africa under apartheid, or Burma today), but such setups are always politically vulnerable. You can imprison some of the people some of the time but not all of the people all of the time. Once such states cease to provide their citizens with enough meager gratifications to buy off revolt, they have no other way of engaging their loyalties, and it is as rational to revolt against such a power as it is to walk out on a brutal parent. Once it appears that nothing could be worse than the present, people will revolt as surely as night follows day. The abject collapse of neo-Stalinism twenty years ago is a case in point. As long as men and women feel there is enough reason to sit quiet, however, it is rational for them to do so, given that the alternative to what they have may be perilous and uncertain. And there is, of course, no guarantee that revolt will not incite an even uglier form of autocracy.

The problem with state violence is that it brings political sovereignty into discredit, hence in the long run defeating its own purpose. Democratic states, which depend heavily on their citizens' consent, are thus particularly loath to resort to prolonged and brutal violence since it will damage their legitimacy and blow their ideological cover. Liberal capitalist societies will take the fascist road only when there appears absolutely no alternative, but there is abundant evidence from the last century, by far the bloodiest on human record, that if an internal crisis is deep enough or an external threat strong enough, take it they will. It is far better, however, to seek to govern consensually, and better also, odd though it may sound, to win popular consent to violent repression. Consent and coercion are not in this sense opposites: if, for example, any juridical system is to work, it must convince enough of its people of the need for such acts of state violence as capital punishment, the occupation of Iraq, or the public stoning of adulterers.

To be truly effective, then, even coercion requires consent. States that persuade men and women to collude in their own repression, and even to reap some masochistic pleasure from the process, are in the long run far harder to shift than genocidal setups like Pol Pot's Cambodia. There are, however, good reasons to suppose that popular collusion will always be ambiguous and provisional. In Freud's eyes, we love the Law
and delight in the way it unburdens us of our guilt by punishing our transgressions so savagely, but we also rejoice in seeing its august power brought low, not least because it is the occasion of so much of our wretchedness. Freud regarded the Law or superego as one of his oldest enemies and spent a lifetime locked in a mortal combat with its death-dealing power.

As a native of eighteenth-century Ireland, Britain’s oldest colony, the political thinker Edmund Burke knew a thing or two about violence. A relative of his was executed by the British when he was young. In his *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757), he put the question of power in terms of gender. The Law itself is of course masculine, and as such must be able to daunt and intimidate us into submission. As a colonial subject, however, Burke was well aware of the limits of brute coercion. The British governed the Irish for several hundred years but never succeeded in enlisting their consent to be ruled. How the British regarded their Irish colonials is obvious enough from the fact that the English word “hooligan” is an Irish surname. Burke knew that coercion breeds rebellion: he had seen as much in the American War of Independence, when as a member of Parliament he bravely supported the insurgents against his own government. He also witnessed the dire effects of nonconsensual rule in the case of India, a subject that unleashed his passionate dissent more eloquently than almost any other.

If the Law was to be effective, Burke argued, it must woo and seduce us as well as terrify us. He was not opposed to the occasional dose of terror, which inculcated habits of reverence and submission among the populace. But terror by itself would generate rancor and rebellion. The Law’s virility thus needed to be sweetened and softened, so that we would come to love it rather than simply respect it, and so obey its edicts all the more eagerly. This is not a simple task, since Burke considered that what we love we tend not to respect, and vice versa. On the other hand, he sees that love and fear are not in fact simple opposites, since as chronically masochistic creatures we enjoy being frightened. The makers of horror movies were not slow to see his point.

Too much terror, however, is counterproductive. It shatters the self rather than stimulating it. So the Law, Burke argued, must deck itself out in female drapery if it is to beguile us. It must become a cross-dresser. The bulge of its phallic power must occasionally be glimpsed through these gorgeous garments, but to strip that phallus bare is to expose the sublime terror of the Law, a sight that will simply stun the citizenry into paralytic fright. It was exactly this, Burke considered, that the French revolutionaries had impiously accomplished, throwing off the decent veils of habit, custom, tradition, and civil society so as to reveal the reality of power in all its traumatic horror. They had not understood that no one can gaze on this Medusa’s head without being turned to stone. Like God himself, the Law is a holy terror that has the power to annihilate us.

To tart power up in alluring garments is to aestheticize it. These comments of Burke, significantly enough, appear in the course
of a treatise on aesthetics, one of the most influential of the modern era. Power can only succeed with the help of artistry, beauty, appearance, disguise. Power without art will lead directly to violence. Civil society for Burke was the place where power is transmuted into manners, civility, decorous conduct, and pleasurable social intercourse, and thus rendered acceptable to us. For the Marxist theoretician Antonio Gramsci a century or so later, civil society was the place where coercion is transformed into hegemony. For radical Romantics like William Blake and Percy Bysshe Shelley, art was the enemy of power. For Burke and his contemporary Jane Austen, culture in the sense of civility was the very medium of such authority.

The connection between culture and violence, however, runs much deeper than this. Burke was one of a range of thinkers, from Blaise Pascal to Immanuel Kant, who warned us not to delve too inquisitively into the sources of civil authority. If we did so, we would discover fairly quickly that the Law had its murky roots in illegality. Most political states, Burke candidly acknowledged, were the fruit of violence, and his own adopted nation of England was no exception. At the origins of legality lay invasion, occupation, revolution, usurpation, and extermination. The process of establishing legality cannot itself be lawful, since the law has yet to come into being. Only in retrospect can such lawless origins be justified, once one has witnessed the civilized values that flow from them. How then is one to deal with this embarrassing truth, which threatens to strip all legitimacy from political institutions and leave them ripe for overturning? The answer can be delivered in three words: Keep it quiet! Repress the barbarous sources of civilization, allow the populace to be lulled into forgetfulness of it, and your power will be secure. Draw a veil of sweet oblivion over this traumatic primal scene, and in time men and women will come to accept your sovereignty as natural. So, indeed, will you.

What legitimates authority, astonishingly, is nothing more glamorous than the sheer passage of time. The further away from your illicit origins you are, the more legitimacy you can muster. This is why states like Israel and Northern Ireland are plagued with instability. In Burke’s England, by contrast, longevity is an argument in itself, and far more persuasive than any mere theory. Like individuals, states need to thrust their traumatic births into the unconscious. Yet they will never be able to do this once and for all. Repression for Freud was a continuous process, not a punctual event. We will never entirely cease to be plagued by our infancy, not least in our sexuality, which is where we are most childlike rather than where we are most mature. The exorbitant violence with which we disavow our origins, fantasizing that we existed from all eternity, will leave its permanent scars on the human psyche, just as it will figure as the obscene secret of political power. At times of crisis, such repressed materials may come welling to the surface to wreak havoc with our conscious projects.

The belief that civilization emerged from barbarism is a great deal older than Burke. It is a motif that haunts ancient Greek tragedies such as Aeschylus’s Oresteia trilogy, in which the problem is how to convert the violence that threatens to
undermine civilization into a defense of it. How are the hideously destructive Furies to become the Eumenides, or Kindly Ones, presiding over the peace of the city? Freud saw that a certain violence was essential to the establishment of civilized society. Unless we exercised power over Nature we would rapidly be overwhelmed by it. There can be no civilization if the land is under water, plagued by poisonous insects, or empty of crops. Those dewy-eyed Westerners who regard any intervention in Nature as an intolerable from of domination should speak to a few Bangladeshis, whose country is unlikely to be around much longer without such decisive action.

Yet the problem, as Freud saw it, is that once a civilized order has been dredged from Nature, the violence involved in this enterprise does not simply evaporate. Instead, it is sublimated, or switched to a higher goal, and this goal, ironically, is the establishment of political sovereignty. The violence that went into the making of human culture becomes a way of defending it against external assault or internal disorder. The Furies become the Kindly Ones. So the Law has its roots in the very violence it is out to suppress. It is this that lends it its furiously anarchic energy. Since the process of sublimation is never entirely effective, the Law is always potentially paranoid, excessive, out of hand. Those of us from Europe are continually amused by the way that twenty US police cars with self-righteously blaring sirens are judged necessary to arrest one pickpocket. The punitiveness of US law has its roots in the nation’s endemic Puritanism, for which the only alternative to rigid order is bound to be utter chaos.

Freud detects in the very excessiveness of our rage for order the presence of the death drive, which likes to subdue reality to its formidable power. In the end, however, this drive can be satisfied only by subjugating things out of existence, mastering them to the point where the life is crushed out of them. What makes for human civilization, then, also threatens to mar it. The violence that wrests human cultures from the slime is always capable of thrusting them back into it. There is something anarchic at the very heart of the impulse to pluck order from chaos. For a certain “progressive” vision, barbarism and civilization form a sequence, as the latter follows in the wake of the former. For a more radical vision, they are not sequential but synchronic, as close as the front and back of the same coin. For every magnificent work of civilization, there is a tale to be told of misery, exploitation, and hard labor. For every high-minded attempt to export so-called Western values to Baghdad or Kabul at the point of a gun and the end of a pair of electrodes, there is a heap of dismembered innocents.

The United States is rightly mindful of those tragically slain on 9/11. It does not seem quite so mindful of that previous 9/11, thirty years before the fall of the World Trade Center, when the United States violently overthrew the democratically elected government of Chile and installed in its place an odious dictator who with US complicity proceeded to murder far more people than died in the Twin Towers. (When I mentioned this in an article for a foreign affairs journal based in Washington, D.C., it was instantly cut out.) As far as I am aware, there are no
memorial services in Washington or New York for the half-million or so leftists who were killed with US collusion by an equally odious autocrat in Indonesia some decades ago. The narrative could be greatly extended. Americans, who like to think well of themselves, could take a few lessons on this score from us Europeans, who have never thought particularly well of ourselves and enjoy nothing more than a good grumble. If one is not so pathologically self-idealizing, one is not likely to be plunged quite so deeply into denial when the violent underside of those ideals inevitably makes its appearance.

Very few people are opposed to violence as such, and rightly so. There is, to be sure, an honorable, much reviled minority of pacifists, who hold as Leo Tolstoy did that any kind of physical violence in any situation is unacceptable. Mercifully, however, such people are rare. If they were not, a great many more individuals might end up dead. Let us imagine that you were standing with a small stick in your hand behind a psychopath who had a machine gun trained on a classroom of schoolchildren. You could easily stun him with the stick but choose not to. No doubt you will have some explaining to do at the next meeting of the PTA. The Roman Catholic Church lays down some rather sensible guidelines for a just war: it must be in self-defense, it must be a last resort, it must not involve the killing of noncombatants, it must have a reasonable hope of success, and so on. None of these conditions was met by the invasion of Iraq or the current debacle in Afghanistan, just as none of them was fulfilled by most of the neoimperial wars in which the United States has engaged over the past few decades, ostensibly in defense of freedom but actually in pursuit of its own material interests.

Almost nobody is absolutely opposed to violence, just as almost nobody is opposed to power, at least when they come to consider the matter. Those who always use the word “power” pejoratively—who mean by power “oppressive power”—forget that they are speaking of the capacity that the powerless are sorely in need of. There is emancipatory power as well as the oppressive variety. Democracy does not mean an opposition to power but popular power. Only those who have enough power already can afford to be so cavalier about the stuff. Power is not necessarily violent; it may be devoted to bringing violence to an end. The history of the working-class movement in Britain is notable for its refusal to embrace violence except in extremis. The reluctance of working people to shed blood has been in marked contrast to the readiness of ruling classes to reach for the gun. And working people have, of course, far less access to the means of violence in any case. It is the state that officially monopolizes those, though that monopoly is now being increasingly challenged by nonstate actors prepared to wreak havoc in the name of a Koran with which they are probably as familiar as Britney Spears is with the Book of Leviticus.

What causes violence, by and large, is ideology. This is as true of a rape as of a pogrom. At root, it is ideas that maim and kill. If squirrels do not embark on genocidal campaigns, it is because among other things they are mercifully bereft of ideas. It is astonishing that in the wake of Auschwitz and Hiroshima we
still have only the vaguest notion of the mechanisms whereby ideology can convince the most sensitive of people that others are inhuman or inferior, and so deserve to be exterminated. One can understand well enough how one might be driven to this view by some desperate material need. But to be driven to it by something as abstract as an idea is strange in the extreme. It is true that such ideas do not operate in a vacuum. Instead, they give body to one of our deepest instincts, which is not hatred but fear. Fear is by no means simply irrational, which is one reason why it is no more possible to eliminate it than it is possible to abolish laughter by state decree. It is prudent and reasonable to be wary of predators. For the most part, it is fear that gives rise to hatred, and that, in turn, to violence. Violence arises when it seems that the only way to eradicate the threat posed by the terrifying other is to eradicate him.

The fact that one can have eminently rational fears, however, complicates the issue somewhat. It seems clear that you can find someone a threat without finding them unnervingly alien and enigmatic. I myself regard Prince Charles as a threat to the democratic well-being of British people, and would press for his speedy abolition, but I do not find him in the least alien or enigmatic. On the contrary, the old-style patrician values he represents are all too drearily familiar. There is a difference between finding some other group, nation, or individual threatening for this or that reason, and finding otherness threatening as such. It is the difference between the political and the pathological.

To be reasonably afraid of others is to believe that they represent a danger to one’s interests or well-being; to be irrationally afraid of others is to believe that they represent some nameless horror within oneself. Without the violent purging of this horror, one’s own identity will remain in pieces, plunged into chaos, bereft of its purity, plundered of its integrity. Those who signify some frightful otherness or negativity within oneself do so not by what they do, or even by what they concretely are, but simply by virtue of not being you. And this, unfortunately, is a deficiency they are unable to repair. Nor would you wish them to, since without them to massacre and repress, one would have no way to resolve one’s problems in vicarious form.

This is one reason why we can expect a world whose conflicts increasingly take racist, cultural, nationalist, and sectarian forms, of the kind that provide the background of Sanja Iveković’s art, to be a more violent place. Conflicts of identity tend to be more intransigent than conflicts of interests, even if the former are often the terms in which the latter are fought out. Liberals and postmodernists should think twice before they unambiguously celebrate the diversity of human identities. Diversity, doubtless one of the great blessings of the species, is also one of its perennial curses. If the world consisted only of a single group of people—say, gay Chinese—we would almost certainly be relieved of a good deal of fruitless contention, not to speak of a good many corpses. Who would not be prepared to put up with a certain monotony if the result was to diminish the ceaseless sound of tearing, hacking, and gouging that is the background music of our global politics?
The other chief source of violence in our world is meaninglessness. Capitalism is not a system that has a great regard for meaning, any more than it has for belief. As long as you roll into work and refrain from beating up police officers, you can forge what meanings you privately choose and believe more or less what takes your fancy. As meaning gradually hemorrhages from social existence, there is a temptation to reinvent it in more and more arbitrary, excessive, extravagant forms, and the increasing casual violence of everyday capitalist life is one pathological symptom of this spiritual vacuity. Violence is a way of reminding oneself that one is still alive, and even that for a fleeting moment—the split second before death of the suicide bomber, for example—one can become a significant actor on the historical stage.

Violence is always a form of abstraction. It is only because we can sever ourselves from the flesh and blood of others through some luminous fetish of an Idea (freedom, patriotism, national unity, the victorious reign of Allah) that we can inflict such appalling damage on it. In this sense, violence has something of the abstraction of desire, which in psychoanalytical terms is purely impersonal and anonymous, passes straight through one tangible object in its restless pursuit of another and yet another, and tosses each of them aside with toddlerlike petulance in its hopeless hunt for the Object of Objects, the transcendental signifier that will say it all, the Omega point where all perspectives bundle together. One traditional name for this infinity of desire in Western modernity has been the Faust legend. Another name is the American Dream.

Like violence, desire has no regard for the sensuous specificity of its object. The opposite of both violence and desire is, in this sense, art, which comes to rest in the sensuous particularity of its objects, treating them as ends in themselves rather than as stepping stones to something else. This is one reason why it is both ironic and appropriate that artists, in the manner of Iveković, should use their art as a medium in which to confront one of its most lethal antagonists, political destruction. Most such destruction happens in the name of utility; art, by contrast, moves under the sign of the self-delighting. It rebukes the ideologies of utility not simply by pointing to the devastation they cause, but in its own self-fulfilling impulse. As that which refuses to exist merely for the sake of something else, it poses a challenge to the crudely instrumental forms of reason that currently hold sway over our social existence, and from which so much violence is bound to follow.

It is true that art can always become a fetish in its own right, and that it is in any case lamentably inadequate to the task of healing a broken civilization. There are events that occurred during the wars in the former Yugoslavia under which language simply breaks, along with any other form of representation—atrocities that cannot be spoken of without blistering the tongue. Yet it is of the nature of art that it will speak out anyway, bearing witness to a more peaceable world not simply in what it says or shows but in the kind of rare phenomenon that it is.
SWEET VIOLENCE

Plates 1–7. (Slatko nasilje). 1974
Video (black and white, sound), 5:56 min.

INSTRUCTIONS NO. 1

Plates 8–15. (Instrukcije br. 1). 1976
Video (black and white, sound), 5:59 min.

MAKE UP–MAKE DOWN

Plates 16–23. 1978
Video (color, sound), 5:14 min.

Sweet Violence (Slatko nasilje), the work that gives this exhibition its title, was among Sanja Iveković's first forays into video. It presents one of the artist's recurring themes: the corrosive effect of media culture under the state doctrine known as the Third Way, a political experiment that took place in Yugoslavia in the 1970s, defined by an idiosyncratic mix of socialism and free-market economics, all steeped in propaganda. Iveković has explained of that period that "even though the national television is still the main ideological weapon of every system, even today it is difficult to imagine the power it wielded in our socialist countries, at a time when there were only two state-sponsored channels to watch." In order to create a distancing effect, and thus make obvious the contrivances and fictive qualities of media reality, Iveković superimposed black bars on a television monitor and then taped one of the daily broadcasts of Zagreb's Ekonomsko propagandni program (Economic propaganda program). With this simple intervention she visually disconnects viewers from the "sweet violence" of media seduction so that they may examine the power of images, the way they circulate in everyday life, the stories they purport to tell, and, by extension, the mythologies that lurk beneath their surfaces.

In two related works, Instructions No. 1 (Instrukcije br. 1) and Make Up–Make Down, Iveković also enlists the video camera to debunk media culture, here using it to reflect on how women's everyday beauty routines are shaped by fixed definitions of femininity. In Instructions No. 1 she faces the camera, draws black ink arrows resembling directions for applying skincare products on her forehead, around her eyes, and on her cheeks, and then massages her face, smudging the ink into smears that look a lot like ritual war paint. Instructions No. 1 brings to mind contemporary video works on the same subject: Representational Painting (1971, fig. 1), in which Eleanor Antin, wearing a brassiere, applies makeup on her face with her fingers, probing the normative logic behind definitions of beauty and fashion; Marxism and Art: Beware of Fascist Feminism (1977, fig. 2), a work that Hannah Wilke called a "performalist self-portrait," in which the artist scars her naked flesh with a swarm of labia-shaped sculptures made of chewing gum; and Art Must Be Beautiful, Artist Must Be Beautiful (1975, fig. 3), in which Marina Abramović brushes her hair, with increasing violence, using a metal brush and comb and repeating the phrase, "Art must be beautiful, artist must be beautiful." In different ways, each of these works exposes the relationship between violence and beauty.

Art historian Izabela Kowalczyk has noted that in the 1970s "beauty was a subversive category." Debunking clichéd notions of beauty has been especially instrumental to Iveković's practice, which draws attention to the politics of gender representation in consumer society, such as in Make Up–Make Down, in which Iveković performs...
the familiar routine of applying makeup at an unusually slow pace, converting an ordinary act into a fetishistic ritual. The video shows the artist’s cleavage and hands in close-up as she rehearses intimate, sensual gestures—opening and closing a tube of concealer, rolling a lipstick up and down in its case, fussing with mascara, and running her finger over the tip of an eyeliner pencil. Her face is kept offscreen, a strategy that critic Tom Holert has linked to a crisis of subjectivity, or as he puts it, a “demonstration of de- or re-facement.” In these early works Iveković expresses a critical attitude toward the effects of media representation of femininity in a patriarchal society—a quality, she asserts, that “in spite of the officially egalitarian policy, [was] always alive and present in Yugoslav socialism.” The crux of her video experiments is the exposure of society’s unrealistic vision of femininity—a perfect image designed according to the trends, icons, and fashions found in the pages of glossy magazines and on television.

Fig. 3. Marina Abramović. Art Must Be Beautiful, Artist Must Be Beautiful. 1975. Performance, 1 hour. Charlottenburg Art Festival, Copenhagen
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In the mid-1970s Iveković’s artistic practice focused on specific facets of the political and social reality in Yugoslavia, which, unlike any other country in the communist bloc, was a hybrid of a one-party system and consumerist values, a country where a socialist, classless society was being built. Unlike women in the other countries behind the Iron Curtain, Yugoslavian women were allowed to follow Western trends, with the result that, as art historian Bojana Pejić has written, in that era “Marxism and Leninism in schools matched with sex, drugs, and rock ‘n’ roll.”¹ This “double-sided optic,” as Pejić has called it, was elucidated in a speech delivered by politician Vida Tomšić at the Communist Party session of October 10, 1948, in which she compared her country’s lifestyle to that in the Soviet Union: “The women we see in the Russian newspapers are all drably dressed. This alleged requirement of socialism negates all that we want—beauty, joy, and diversity. We should teach our women how to dress well and how to clean their homes so they can do it quickly.”² Thus on the one hand Tomšić supports diversity by encouraging women to be well dressed, but on the other hand she reinforces the idea that it is women who are expected to deal efficiently with domestic chores. She testifies to the paradoxical power of patriarchy in socialist society and to the division of women’s roles in private and public life.

In Double Life (Dvostruki život), a series of sixty-four pairs of pictures originally published as an artist’s book (fig. 1), Iveković provides a poignant lens on the politics of media representation of the new Yugoslavian woman.³ One of each pair is an image of the artist during various periods of her life, from 1953 to 1976, and the other features models from women’s lifestyle magazines from different countries, such as Amica, Anna Bella, Brigitte, Duga, Elle, Grazia, Marie Claire, and Svijet, advertising beauty products, kitchenware, and new consumer products that claim to make a woman’s life more pleasant and efficient. Public and private images are matched on the basis of similarities of gesture, situation, props, and location. In one pair (plate 47), a photograph showing Iveković as a pensive first-year student at the Akademija likovnih umjetnosti, Zagreb, in 1966, is matched with an Estée Lauder cosmetics ad from the May 1974 issue of Brigitte, in which the model adopts a similarly absorbed pose. In another pairing a snapshot showing the artist lounging on a sofa at home is set next to a racy Guy Bourdin fashion editorial for Elle (plate 58). In each Double Life work Iveković documented the ads’ sources and publication dates and included a caption about the context of each personal photograph, all of which were culled from her own family albums. Most of the snapshots, which are informal and candid, predate those in the magazines with which they are paired, making it clear that the artist was not mimicking, aspiring to, or rehearsing the models’ poses; instead she reveals the uncanny resemblance and then ultimately shatters the illusion. This “retroactive perspective,” art historian


Branislava Andjelković has pointed out, sets Double Life apart from similar self-transformations in other artists’ works. Unlike Cindy Sherman, who impersonated fictional characters in her series of black-and-white Untitled Film Stills (1977–80), Iveković is not masquerading in different roles but exploring her own life as a series of roles retroactively assigned. “Paradoxically,” Andjelković concluded, “this project is a double investigation: an investigation into the social condition of consumerism and its reflection in a socialist framework, but more importantly an investigation into her personal role as a woman in structuring social conditions.”

In Tragedy of a Venus (Tragedija jedne Venere), a related picture-story series, Iveković probes the impact of the lives of Hollywood celebrities on those of ordinary people. Here she pairs photographs of Marilyn Monroe (the archetype of feminine desirability), taken from a 1975 article published in the tabloid Duga, with snapshots in which the artist appears as a ballerina or strikes mocking glamorous poses for the camera. Using an endless repertoire of roles, poses, and personas derived from magazine ads, fashion photography, and tabloids, Iveković calls attention to a kind of fame, quite common in the West, that was unimaginable for an Eastern European artist. These two series present the fictions on both sides, both of public and private narratives, of Iveković’s invented double life; she suggests that a magazine advertisement and a personal snapshot have become analogous in a world increasingly experienced through images. These works extend an argument Hannah Höch initiated in the 1920s with photomontages (e.g., fig. 2) that tapped and reshuffled media constructs of femininity to examine the equivocal status of women in post–World War I Germany; here Iveković articulates the extent to which advertising’s fictions are also the reality in which we live. The constitution of gender and subjectivity are exposed as the work of culture or, as philosopher Judith Butler put it in her influential book Gender Trouble (1990), as an act, an impersonation, a set of codes, costumes, and masks rather than an essential aspect of identity. Double Life and Tragedy of a Venus point to the disappearance of the world into representation and lay bare the constructed roles that women subconsciously carry into their day-to-day existence.
TRAGEDY OF A VENUS
Seksepinost kao glavno oružje:
Klorane non vi promette una pelle da bambina.
Perché anche una bambina ha bisogno di Klorane.

Di solito si dà alla pelle di una bambina come aspetto di grande pregio.
Perché una bambina si sapeva una sanguigna, una fanciulla. Non poteva mai essere una bambina una pelle da bambina.
Ma poteva avere una pelle pulita e non grigia su un viso e più grigio alla pelle della gamba, la pelle della mano è la pelle del naso.
Ma poteva avere una pelle pulita e non grigia sulla pelle del viso.
Klorane non vi promette una pelle da bambina.
Perché anche una bambina ha bisogno di Klorane

Klorane, tutto per la pelle e il corpo. L'unico prodotto ideato per le pelli più sensibili: i pelli più forti. La pelle più forte.

Foto: Jeppe, 1974.
1966. kao student 1. god. na AIU Zagreb.
Estée Lauder's feuchtigkeits-konservierende Performance Creme

Pflege-Hochleistung für Ihre Haut – vielleicht zum ersten Mal in Ihrem Leben.

Verbessern Sie die Leistungsfähigkeit der Haut – und Sie verbessern Ihr Aussehen. Die im Gewebe festgehaltene Feuchtigkeit ist entscheidend für die frische, glatte Hautoberfläche. Estée Lauder's Performance Creme versorgt die Haut nicht nur mit Feuchtigkeit, sondern erhöht auch ihre Fähigkeit, Feuchtigkeit zu binden.


Histoire des Françaises

Une histoire qui s'est écrite au fil des ans. Un passé et un avenir qui se sont entrelacés. Il est difficile de séparer la femme de sa culture, de sa langue, de sa beauté. Elle est, en quelque sorte, le reflet de l'histoire des Françaises.

On connaît 30 beautés chez la femme.

Quand Helena Rubinstein lance une gamme de vernis à ongles, il ne s'agit pas seulement de 12 nouvelles couleurs.
Plates 54–55
Dieses schicke Kleid können Sie von Größe 40 bis 44 nacharbeiten!

Lies auf, um weitere Informationen zu erhalten.
In a 2009 interview Iveković pointed out that she and other artists who were active in Yugoslavia’s counterculture in the 1970s “took the socialist project far more seriously than the cynical governing political elite.”1 This seriousness is clear in works that examine, in light of the artist’s feminism and political activism, the discrepancy between the colorful, stereotypical image of happy consumers prevalent in the media and the often harsher reality of private lives. Curators Nataša Ilić and Dejan Kršić have written that Iveković’s early works “are as much a critique of socialism (as a social order that claimed to represent human rights as equated with workers’ rights) as an investigation of confused identities caused by a media overflow that blurs the difference between reality and its mediations.”2

In her iconic photomontages made in the mid-1970s—including Diary, Structure, and Eight Tears—Iveković exposes the politics of gender representation by dissecting advertising’s values, which have become the standard for stereotypical feminine glamour and desire.

In Diary (Dnevnik), comprising seven photomontages, Iveković juxtaposes advertisements for beauty products cut from women’s magazines with cotton makeup-removal pads she used over the course of a week. The models in the ads are all characterized by their garish makeup, which turns them into fetishistic products. The pictures are dated for each day of the week and signed. With this work Iveković set the ground for her first performance, Un Jour violente (1976, fig. 1), in which she used makeup and clothing to change her looks according to the guidelines in a cosmetics advertisement in Marie Claire that encouraged women to live glamorous lives: “One day, violent: today you are dazzling, you don’t yourself know why, you feel an irresistible joy, you want sparkling drinks, intensive light, unusual hairstyles, provoking dresses.”3 To enact this assignment, Iveković displayed the props cited in the advertisement (flowers, refreshments, record player, clothes) around a performance space in which she struck poses, adopted and discarded roles, and did her clothing and makeup according to the ad’s recommendations (mysterious, for night) while audio of a voice reading the text played over loudspeakers. Like Diary, Un Jour violente exposes the constructed nature of feminine identity with explicit reference to the cosmetic industry, which perpetuates feminine ideals by selling beauty rituals to women.

This exploration of mass media’s socioideological effect is present in many of Iveković’s works of the period, including Structure (Struktura), which consists of ten newspaper pictures of women of various age groups and backgrounds that have been multiplied ten times and arranged in a grid. Each of the ten pictures in the first row has a different handwritten caption taken from various newspapers. In subsequent rows the captions are redistributed among the pictures in new combinations, so that each image is presented in
ten different semantic contexts. Anne, Princess Royal of England, appears with the caption “Sought consolation in horse racing and nightlife”; Patty Hearst with the caption “Expecting her master’s return”; an unidentified woman with “Executed in Bubanj in 1944”; the Yugoslavian actress Beba Lončar with “Learned how to be photogenic”; and Ellen Stewart, founding director of the experimental theater club La MaMa, with “Finally find [sic] the time to shorten her trousers.” These pairings deconstruct the binding status of the standard media format (an image accompanied by a caption), and with them Ivčević unfolds the banality of media language used to simplify the plurality of feminine selves. *Eight Tears* (*Osam suza*), in a similar vein, is made up of eight identical ads for a Helena Rubinstein perfume, each showing a woman with a teardrop on her cheek, accompanied by various words and images. The last image in the series is shown with the text “Helena Rubinstein presents Courant: The perfume that expresses all that a woman can feel,” and in the preceding seven images the original text has been erased and replaced with a small, kitschy color picture of a different woman, with the captions “Love,” “Work,” “Marriage,” “Household,” “Motherhood,” “Old Age,” and “Ego.” By presenting femininity as a positional game—the mimicking of poses, accessories, makeup, and situations fashioned by society—Ivčević reveals how gender representation intersects with mass-media fictions.
DIARY
STRUCTURE
Sought consolation in horse racing and nightlife

Expecting her master’s return

Executed in Bubanj in 1944

A life full of suffering
NO ONE HAS SUED HER YET

BORED OF THE GOOD-GIRL ROLE

COMPLETELY UNKNOWN A YEAR AGO

PERSISTENTLY TRIED TO BECOME A MOTHER
LEARNED HOW TO BE PHOTOGENIC

FINALLY FIND THE TIME TO SHORTEN HER TROUSERS
EIGHT TEARS
Helena Rubinstein donosi Courant. Parfem koji može izraziti sve ono što žena može osjetiti.
In 1976 Iveković began to more violently alter advertisements in order to defamiliarize them, to turn them into an unsurprising antithesis of seductive high-fashion veneer. One such work is Paper Women, a series of magazine ads, featuring beautiful models, that have in some way been defaced—torn apart, cut into pieces, scratched, or perforated—so that each picture bears tactile evidence of the artist's attack. Here Iveković uncovers the violence that lurks behind beauty's polished surface by shattering the image itself, as she does in Make-Up, a black-and-white image of a woman's flawless face that has been pierced with colored pins; My Scar. My Signature (Girls) (Moj ožiljak–moj potpis [djevojke]), consisting of full-page ads in which Iveković smeared women's faces with lipstick kisses (the distinctive mark of her bottom lip, scarred in a childhood accident, is intentionally brought into play); and My Scar. My Signature (Ads) (Moj ožiljak–moj potpis [oglasi]), a related work that features ads for exhibitions from Flash Art magazine. With this group of works, and several others, including Contract (Ugovor, 1979), Iveković posits an anti-institutional critique of the art world as well as that of consumer culture.

Iveković's analysis of traditional power structures and the clichés of gender representation finds parallels in the works of other women artists in the 1970s, such as Martha Wilson's Perfection and Deformation (1974), a diptych of the artist as ideal woman and grotesque; Geta Brătescu's Self-Portrait Toward White (1975), a photographic sequence in which the artist's face is gradually veiled and unveiled in a gesture of self-effacement; and Birgit Jürgenssen's Ich möchte hier raus! (I want out of here!, 1976; fig. 1), a portrait of the artist, neatly dressed, with a white lace collar and brooch, pressing her cheek and hands against the glass wall of the display case she is trapped in. These works and others suggest that the condition of womanhood in a patriarchal system relies on repressive codes of beauty and domesticity.
Among the most explicitly feminist are Barbara Kruger’s works using images culled from mass-circulation sources. In “Untitled” (We won’t play nature to your culture) (1983, fig. 2), the jolting words of the title are superimposed on a closely cropped advertisement featuring a recumbent young woman sunbathing, her eyes covered by tiny leaves. If the woman’s static and supine pose suggests outdated conventions of female representation, the title’s feminist retort disrupts the binary structure of language and of other orders of meaning in which men are perceived as producers of culture and women as products of nature. Other artists, such as VALIE EXPORT, Ana Mendieta, Martha Rosler, Cindy Sherman, and Hannah Wilke, have played an equally instrumental role in modifying our perceptions of the conventions of femininity by questioning ubiquitous media stereotypes.

In Yugoslavia, Iveković’s pioneering efforts coincided with the feminist movement, which had particular cultural reverberations in the urban centers of Belgrade and Zagreb. In October 1978 the Student Cultural Center (SKC), Belgrade, organized a historic event, “Drugarica Žena. Žensko pitanje—novi pristup?” (Comradess woman: the women’s question—a new approach?)—the first international feminist conference to be held in a communist country.1 The question mark in the title suggested that the meeting was not intended to draw conclusions but rather to offer a platform for debate. A publication in English and Serbo-Croatian included texts about Marxist feminism and psychoanalysis by such authors as Luce Irigaray, Alexandra Kollontai, and Juliet Mitchell, among others.2 Iveković did not attend the conference, but she sought out other feminist seminars, primarily those organized by Zagreb philosophers and sociologists on progressive topics related to gender construction, women’s status in society, and sexism in the private sphere and the labor market. Iveković soon became one of the most prominent artists engaged with gender politics in East-Central Europe. Questions of media representation proved to be critical to her thinking and acquired further urgency in the late 1980s and early 1990s, when she began to expand her feminist concerns in response to the political changes sweeping Yugoslavia: the advent of war among the republics within the federation and the resulting acts of dominion, offense, and violence against women.

Fig. 2. Barbara Kruger. “Untitled” (We won’t play nature to your culture). 1983. Gelatin silver print, 6’ 1” x 49” (185.4 x 124.5 cm)
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A gauche, une vraie Nathalie, 15 ans
un sourire de Myriam, 14 ans
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Le pelli disidratate soffrono
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MAKE-UP

Plate 102
Political theorist Hannah Arendt pointed out in *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951) that in order to ensure unrestricted control over its citizenry the totalitarian state must establish its secret police “as the executors and guardians of its domestic experiment in constantly transforming reality into fiction.”¹ This quote, from twenty-five years before Iveković’s works of the late 1970s, is nonetheless a suitable introduction to them, most specifically to *Triangle* (*Trokut*). On May 10, 1979, Iveković engaged in an act of political defiance when she performed *Triangle* on the balcony of her Savska Street apartment during one of Josip Broz Tito’s official visits to Zagreb. During the festivities, she came out, dressed in an American T-shirt, to her balcony, which overlooked the street along which the presidential motorcade slowly advanced, and sat in a chair with a glass of Ballantine whiskey, cigarettes, and some foreign books alongside her on a small table. (Her props were selected to invoke an alternative, Western society or, as art critic Jan Verwoert has suggested, to “be seen in analogy with Yvonne Rainer’s provocative use of American flags in a dance performance,” as some sort of “utopian signifiers.”)² Once settled, Iveković picked up Tom Bottomore’s *Elites and Society*, a 1964 sociological study of power relationships in modern society, and as she read, she pretended to masturbate. She knew she was being watched, by an agent of the Uprava državne bezbednosti, the Communist secret police, atop the Hotel Intercontinental across the street, and the titular triangle completed itself when, eighteen minutes into the performance, the police rang Iveković’s doorbell and commanded her to stop her activities. Cultural historian Piotr Piotrowski has recollected that “despite the illusory atmosphere of liberalism, the citizens of Yugoslavia were rather carefully watched,” and in this context *Triangle* should be understood to expose “the visually based discipline to which the body, above all the female’s body and her sexual desires, is subjected.”³


of passive spectatorship of military exhibitionism: people watching a presidential parade of men in uniform and a girl watching a frog make revolution happen like something from a fairy tale.

In these works, particularly in *Triangle*, Iveković contrasts the excesses of the state with the private sphere. *Triangle*, she has explained, “was a performance in which a woman was actually provoking a male gaze, and of course it’s about power and a person who is under control, and in this case it was a woman.” The gaze she provoked was not that of an ordinary individual but of a male agent charged with maintaining civic discipline and visual order, making *Triangle*, as Bojana Pejić has pointedly written, “a performance ‘about’ the *liaison dangereuse* between sight and power, between *voir* and *pouvoir.*” Tapping the persuasive language of political performance, Iveković offers a critique of the masculine cult of the leader and its Soviet-style system of political surveillance.


Sanja Iveković  
TROKUT (TRIANGLE)  
1979

Performance / photographs  
Time: 18 min

The action takes place on the day of the President Tito’s visit to the city, and it develops as intercommunication between three persons:

1. a person on the roof of a tall building across the street of my apartment;
2. myself, on the balcony;
3. a policeman in the street in front of the house.

Due to the cement construction of the balcony, only the person on the roof can actually see me and follow the action. My assumption is that this person has binoculars and a walkie-talkie apparatus. I notice that the policeman in the street also has a walkie-talkie.

The action begins when I walk out onto the balcony and sit on a chair. I sip whiskey, read a book, and make gestures as if I perform masturbation. After a period of time the policeman rings my doorbell and orders that «the persons and objects are to be removed from the balcony»

Savska 1  
Zagreb, 10 May 1979
NEW ZAGREB (PEOPLE BEHIND THE WINDOWS)
Mother and Child

Let's dance together!
WAITING FOR THE REVOLUTION (ALICE)
Ivčević’s videos from the 1980s establish a link between everyday and media realities in order to underscore the medium’s status as a tool of dissemination. In 1973 she conceived TV Timer (fig. 1) for Trigon ’73: Audiovisuelle Botschaften, in Graz, Austria, one of the first events in East-Central Europe to focus on the new medium of video. Working in collaboration with Dalibor Martinis, Ivčević produced fifteen one-minute videos meant to be inserted like commercials into the prime-time evening-news program on the Austrian television station ORF. Given the restrictive social environment that prevailed in Austria at the time, the artists could not get permission to broadcast the videos, so they decided instead to present the project in a gallery where, to achieve the intended effect, they connected a television set to a timer that triggered a VCR to break into the news at precise intervals. The videos were short sequences that questioned the notion of time as a source of objective information. In one, for instance, Ivčević asks a passerby what time it is. He looks at his watch and says it is 9:30 a.m., the artist argues that it is actually 7:15 p.m., and the video in fact interrupts the evening news at 7:15 p.m. It would be another decade before the space of television was made available to artists in East-Central Europe: in 1983 Dunja Blažević, a producer and curator of new media, presented the video program TV Gallery on TV Belgrade.

In 1982 Ivčević presented Personal Cuts (Osobni rezovi) on prime-time Yugoslavian national television, on TV Zagreb’s 3, 2, 1—kreni! (3, 2, 1—action!). In it she confronts the camera wearing a translucent black stocking mask pulled over her head terrorist-style. Using scissors she cuts one hole after another into the mask, revealing one section of her face at a time, and each cut is followed by a short sequence of archival footage culled from a television program on the history of Yugoslavia, produced by the state shortly after Marshal Tito’s death, in 1980, and chronicling twenty years of the socialist republic. Cut by cut, in sequential shots, Ivčević at once exposes her face and suggests the insidiousness of national propaganda—mass rallies, a public address by Tito, and monuments, all promoting the socialist way of living—thus demonstrating that historical events are inextricable from human ones, and ending with the artist’s face fully uncovered. Curator Silvia Eiblmayr has pointed out that the work’s “images of the past produced by the state to create a political identity—this mixture of nostalgia and ideology—turn out to be a part of the artist’s own history.”


2. Silvia Eiblmayr, “Osobni rezovi (Personal Cuts),” in Roger M. Buergel and Ruth Noak, eds., How Do We Want to Be Governed? (Figure and Ground) (Miami: Miami Art Central, 2004), p. 64.
In 1987 Iveković created *Lighthouse* (*Svjetionik*), a video installation using mass media as archival store of imagery, instrument for dissemination, and art medium. The installation’s structure suggests a lighthouse, with a television monitor atop a tall frame made of metal scaffolding. Every five seconds the monitor shows snippets of private and public video clips followed by five seconds of blackness, a tempo that suggests memory’s mix of flashbacks, blackouts, and partially knowable truths. The video segments, appropriated from the Yugoslavian national television station (reporting events of historical significance) and the artist’s home videos (showing daily family scenes, including images of the artist’s daughter from birth until puberty), make up a fourteen-year video diary. Here, as in other works, Iveković’s primary concerns are revealed: the intersection of history with the private self and the way mass media operates in the socialist system of propaganda.
PERSONAL CUTS
LIGHTHOUSE
The long period from 1982 to 1995—from Iveković’s *Practice Makes a Master* (*Übung macht den Meister*) to her *General Alert* (*Soap Opera*) (*Opća opasnost [sapunica]*)—was defined by historic events: Marshal Tito’s death in May 1980, the erosion of political power in the pro-Soviet governments of nearby countries, and the dismantling of the Berlin Wall in November 1989. This last event began the splintering of the communist bloc and the reconfiguration of Europe’s political structure. But in Yugoslavia the death of Tito did not herald a transition to democracy; rather, that period saw an intensification of interethnic tensions that followed Slobodan Milošević’s rise to power in Serbian politics in 1987. His subsequent fueling of militant nationalist sentiment led to three wars—in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo—and nearly a decade of bloodshed, earning him the sobriquet Butcher of the Balkans. Milošević declared himself president of Serbia in 1989 and began pitting his fellow Serbs against the Slovenes, Croats, Bosnians, and Albanians of Kosovo, stirring up an incendiary nationalism. War trauma, along with the economic crisis in the 1990s, led the republics to demand autonomy. Croatia proclaimed its independence in 1991, and war broke out immediately afterward, when the Serbian-controlled Yugoslav People’s Army began to attack Croatian cities, an onslaught that lasted until 1995.

Iveković first performed *Practice Makes a Master* in 1982 at Künstlerhaus Bethanien, Berlin. The video documenting that performance shows the artist in a black evening dress on a stage, her head hooded by a white plastic bag. Her body suddenly jolts violently, and she falls to the ground. She lies immobile for several seconds and then gets up. A few seconds later she falters, falls again, and lies on the stage with legs outstretched. She stands and falls and repeats these actions over and over again. A spotlight switches on and off with a regular rhythm. All the while a sensual tune sung by Marilyn Monroe, from the sound track of the movie *Bus Stop* (1956), is progressively slowed until the female voice starts to sound like a man’s. The score is disrupted by the jarring clamor of guns and other machines from video games, recorded by the artist in New York the previous year.

*Practice Makes a Master* is a compelling study of the rehearsal of violence and psychological savagery. The body’s sudden and repetitive shifts, from standing to prone, provokes in viewers a nauseating disequilibrium. In another reading of the work, Tom Holert has pointed out the perverse relationship between cruelty and comedy: “The scene instantly brings to mind a stand-up comedy act where the routine is so utterly absurd and of such peculiar masochistic brutality, as if its sole purpose was to elucidate the dark and violent side of slapstick.”¹ In 2009 Iveković asked dancer Sonja Pregrad to reenact *Practice Makes a Master* at the Akademie der Künste, Berlin, and at BAK, basis voor actuele kunst, Utrecht, the Netherlands.²

¹. Tom Holert, “Face-Shifting: Violence and Expression in the Work of Sanja Iveković,” in Nataša Ilić and Kathrin Rhomberg, eds., *Sanja Iveković: Selected Works* (Barcelona: Fundació Antoni Tàpies, 2008), p. 26. The poster for the original 1982 performance shows an exercise book with the title of the piece written in German on its cover. Holert has pointed out that while the poster alludes to the idea of school as a disciplinary institution, the performance evokes something more harsh—an interrogation cell and a torture chamber.

². The performance was reenacted in conjunction with the exhibition *Sanja Iveković: Urgent Matters*, Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven, and BAK, basis voor actuele kunst, Utrecht, the Netherlands, April 18–August 2, 2009.
This contemporary restaging brought to mind the War on Terror and the images of torture that have followed in the wake of the September 11 attacks, as well as more recent violence.

General Alert (Soap Opera), a video work that Iveković produced in 1995, six years after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of communism in East-Central Europe and during the last year of a bitterly fought war among the former Yugoslavian republics, suggests the cognitive dissonance of everyday life during wartime. The video shows excerpts from a highly popular soap opera, in Spanish with Croatian subtitles, that was aired on public television as Zagreb was under heavy missile attacks, which explains the warning that appears repeatedly at the top of the screen: OPĆA OPASNOST ZAGREB (general alert Zagreb). Here Iveković captures the way the real war creeps into the soap opera’s narrative, highlighting a disparity between actual and make-believe events with an urgency equal to Martha Rosler’s antiwar photomontage series Bringing the War Home (1967–72, fig. 1), which the artist created during a time of increased intervention by the United States military in Vietnam. Splicing together Life magazine pictures of Vietnamese citizens maimed in the war with images of the homes of affluent Americans culled from the pages of House Beautiful, Rosler literalized the conflict in Vietnam, known as the “living room war” because of the way the news of ongoing carnage in Southeast Asia filtered into tranquil American homes through television reports. Made in a different context, that of a war at home, General Alert (Soap Opera) captures both the reality and fiction of war, the jarring mix of realities: the melodramatic soap opera actresses, crying and emoting, and the drama of shelling attacks. By urging viewers to reconsider the “here” and “there” of the world picture, these works reveal the extent to which a collective experience of war is inseparable from and shaped by media images.3

PRACTICE MAKES A MASTER
GENERAL ALERT (SOAP OPERA)
OPĆA OPASNOST
ZAGREB

Da. Ako je on živ...
On je mrzio moju mamu!
OPĆA OPASNOST
ZAGREB

Ako je doista tvoj rođak
Alejandro.... -Ako je on živ...

OPĆA OPASNOST
ZAGREB
As Titoist Yugoslavia began to disintegrate, Iveković focused on works and performances about the harsh conditions—the war, rape, and extreme nationalism—that marked life in Croatia in the 1990s. Resnik, which takes its name from a refugee camp near Zagreb, addresses the condition of some two thousand war refugees, most of them Muslim, in the early 1990s. The video installation takes place in a darkened space, with a video projection as the sole source of light. The space is filled with a number of potted plants of varying heights, most of them human size, that wilt and die over time. The video, projected through the plants, shows a desolate, uninhabited winter landscape seen from the window of a moving train; this view is interrupted by textual sequences, with white words that pop up here and there against a black background and then just as suddenly disappear, accompanied by the sound of dripping water. These visual poems are made up of words that don’t form any particular syntactical structure: denial, exile, lost, past, present, alien, borders, exist. The installation opens up a space in which viewers can reflect on the unofficial narrative of war: violence and ethnic cleansing, forced exile and dispossession, destruction of the individual and loss of respect for human life. Unlike official history, which constructs a grand, elucidating narrative, Resnik evokes the fragmented existence of refugees and the circumstances of their daily experience.

The question of how most effectively to memorialize historic events continues to be present in Iveković’s work of the last two decades. Traditional monuments either extol or absolve the deeds of history and often end up discounting individual stories in order to create an official whole, reducing visitors to passive observers. Cultural historian James E. Young has written that once we ascribe “monumental form to memory we have to some degree divested ourselves of the obligation to remember,” thus arresting instead of regenerating the possibility of historical understanding.1

In 2005 Iveković created Rohrbach Living Memorial, a work that shifts the typology of the memorial from enduring monument to transient and performative work, a “working through” of history.2 In collaboration with the Austrian women’s organization Frauentreffpunkt, she invited the citizens of the small town of Rohrbach to perform a living memorial for Holocaust victims for whom no permanent national monument had been erected. The performance was based on a photograph from the 1940s, showing Roma and Sinti people waiting to be deported to a concentration camp. Iveković reenacted the photograph with the citizens of Rohrbach, who were asked to assemble in a public square in the early hours of the morning and wait in silence until noon. This quiet reflection on genocide from the perspective of the victims was documented in a video work that is presented across from the original photograph and a book of interviews with the participants about their reasons for taking part in the project (fig. 1). By confronting the irrecoverable past through the process of

---

2. The term “working through” is used by Benjamin H. D. Buchloh in reference to Anselm Kiefer’s work *Besetzungen* (Occupations), which was published in the Cologne art journal *Interfunktionen* in 1975. The work consists of pictures of Kiefer in the privacy of his apartment and in public spaces—by the Colosseum in Rome, in front of an equestrian statue of Louis XIV framed by the Arc de Triomphe in Montpellier, France—giving the “Heil Hitler” salute. According to Buchloh the pictures, showing something performed exclusively for the camera, attempt a “real working through of German history.… You have to inhabit [history] to overcome it.” Buchloh, quoted in Christine Mehring, “Continental Schrift: The Story of *Interfunktionen*,” *Artforum* 42, no. 9 (May 2004): 179.
active commemoration rather than locked-up memorialization, *Rohrbach Living Memorial* creates a context for an intergenerational testimony.

In 2010, for the Gwangju Biennale, Iveković conceived the living memorial *On the Barricades* (fig. 2), made in memory of the people who lost their lives in the Gwangju People’s Uprising, on May 18, 1980, a popular revolt against the harsh military rule of then-president Chun Doo-hwan and the birth of South Korea’s struggle for democracy. The work comprised ten video monitors continuously displaying 314 black-and-white portraits of the victims, which were collected from family members and digitally altered so that each person appears with his or her eyes closed; the images were presented alongside a live performance of volunteers standing on a platform like statues, eyes shut, humming the uprising’s solemn anthem. With this series of countermonuments—alongside *Lady Rosa of Luxembourg* (2001, plates 167–71) and *Poppy Field* (2007)—Iveković probed, as Tom Holert has put it, “the conditions for a politics of remembrance in a globalized monument sphere.”

MOVE
RIGHT
LEFT
AHEAD
WRONG
CAUSE
REFUGEE
TURN
ROHRBACH LIVING MEMORIAL
“In all my work since the beginning of the seventies,” Iveković has written, “three major themes have preoccupied me the most: gender, identity and memory. For me, as a visual artist, the starting point of my research is the visual representation of woman in our everyday life transmitted to us by mass media. As a feminist, I have tried to make art that reflects my political consciousness of what it means to be a woman in a patriarchal culture” (fig. 1).1

Among the projects that represent Iveković’s feminist position, Lady Rosa of Luxembourg is her most public statement. When Iveković was invited to participate in Manifesta 2, in 1998, in Luxembourg, she imagined a project about the history of the capital city. She proposed a civic intervention that would be titled Pregnant Memory and would involve removing the gilded, larger-than-life neoclassical Nike (the allegorical female figure of victory) from the war memorial known as Gëlle Fra (Golden lady): the figure would have been taken from the top of its sixty-nine-foot obelisk in Constitution Square, in the center of the city, and installed on the premises of a shelter for abused women. Gëlle Fra was designed in 1923 by the Luxembourgian sculptor Claus Cito in memory of the volunteers who fought with the Allies in World War I; in 1940, during the Nazi occupation, it was dismantled and placed in storage, and it wasn’t until 1985 that it was reerected with a plaque including the names of the fallen soldiers of World War II. Iveković’s proposal was deemed too controversial and remained unrealized. Instead, in collaboration with women at a shelter for victims of domestic violence, she produced Women’s House (Ženska kuća), an installation of plaster casts of the women’s faces with short biographical texts.

Three years later Iveković was invited to rethink her initial proposal as part of the exhibition Luxembourg, Luxembourgians: Consensus and Bridled Passions, organized by Casino Luxembourg and the Musée d’Histoire de la Ville de Luxembourg. It was then that she created Lady Rosa of Luxembourg, a same-size replica of the Gëlle Fra with three critical interventions: the new monument was dedicated to the Marxist philosopher and activist Rosa Luxemburg, who was executed for her radical political ideas in 1919; Nike was turned into a visibly pregnant woman; and the original commemorative plaque honoring male heroism was replaced with words in French, German, and English: “LA RÉSISTANCE, LA JUSTICE, LA LIBERTÉ, L’INDEPENDENCE” (resistance, justice, liberty, independence); “KITSCH, KULTUR, KAPITAL, KUNST” (kitsch, culture, capital, art); and “WHORE, BITCH, MADONNA, VIRGIN.”2

Installed walking distance from the Gëlle Fra, Lady Rosa of Luxembourg unmasks the way women are forced to occupy a symbolic order that, as curators Nataša Ilić and Dejan Kršić have pointed out, “[denies them] historical agency.”3 Women

---

2. Lady Rosa of Luxembourg was on public view in Luxembourg from March 31 to June 24, 2001.
played a significant role in Luxembourg’s resistance movement during World War II, but their fight has been kept out of official history; instead they are represented simply as symbolic bearers of national history, as idealized, allegorical figures such as Nike. By making Nike pregnant and renaming her after a real woman, Iveković restores the female figure to its rightful historical position.

Lady Rosa of Luxembourg provoked a fierce debate that played out in newspaper headlines, on television shows, and in hundreds of articles and Internet discussions. The most violent opposition focused not on the pregnant figure but on the plaque; the displacement of ideals of male bravery by abusive terms regularly used to describe women evidently touched a nerve. Iveković had flouted memorial conventions, tying everyday feminine dissidence to past resistance. The polemic escalated and came to a head with calls for the resignation of Erna Hennicot-Schoepges, Luxembourg’s minister of culture. The most memorable of Iveković’s public art projects, Lady Rosa of Luxembourg renegotiates the memorial’s purpose by questioning the conventions of social remembrance and insisting on justice for women.

For the duration of Iveković’s exhibition at The Museum of Modern Art, New York, in 2011, the project will be re-created in MoMA’s Donald B. and Catherine C. Marron Atrium with documentation of its original reception and controversy, which has become part of the monument’s own memory. Lady Rosa of Luxembourg constitutes a case study in the tradition of countermonuments—monuments that at once use the conventions of heroic form and reverse public expectations of it.

Fig. 1. Attendees at “Co-Operation: The International Forum for Feminist Theory and Art Practice,” organized by Iveković (center row; fourth from left), Dubrovnik, Croatia, September 2000
LADY ROSA OF LUXEMBOURG
Since the beginning of her career, Iveković has brought a feminist perspective and critical eye to diverse visual representations of women, first in socialist Yugoslavia and later within the nation-states. After the civil war in the 1990s, Iveković intensified her investigation of the connections between politics and violence against women and of the collective amnesia about the socialist era that was heavily imposed by the new conservative government. In Gen XX, a work originally published in small-circulation Croatian magazines such as Arkin, Zaposlena, Frakcija, Kontura, and Kruh i ruže (Bread and roses), she appropriated magazine ads featuring professional models, excising the products’ brands and replacing the logos with the charges brought against and execution dates of young, female antifascist militants—Dragica Končar, Nada Dimić, Ljubica Gerovac, the Baković sisters, Anka Butorac, and Nera Šafarić—all of them imprisoned, tortured, or executed by the quisling regime in Croatia during World War II. One such text reads, “Nada Dimić: Charged with anti-fascist activities. Tortured and executed in Novagradiska in 1942. Age at the time of death: 19.” The only photograph in the series that is not of a model is of Šafarić, Iveković’s mother, as a young woman, taken from the artist’s family album rather than from a fashion magazine. A fighter in the People’s Liberation War, Šafarić was persecuted for her antifascist activities. In 1942, at age twenty-three, she was arrested in Crikvenica and deported to Auschwitz, where she remained until the end of the war. These women were considered national socialist heroines, but in the postcommunist period their stories fell into oblivion. By layering accounts of the cruelty of their treatment with eye-catching advertising images, Iveković reintroduces their histories into the consciousness of today’s amnesiac society.

Women’s House (Sunglasses) (Ženska kuća [sunčane naočale]) focuses on other issues of the social disregard and gender violence hidden in postcommunist Croatia, as it was in other democratic nations, with advertisements for well-known brands of sunglasses altered to include short texts about the living conditions of battered women. Presented in the form of posters, billboards, and inserts in magazines, the series has been shown in various countries, including Croatia, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Serbia, Thailand, and Turkey, and each time the artist has emphasized inequities specific to the country of exhibition.1 Women’s House (Sunglasses) underscores Iveković’s engagement with feminist causes; she has founded or been engaged with Croatian women’s organizations such as ELEKTRA—Women’s Art Center; B.a.B.e./Be active, Be emancipated; Autonomous Cultural Center—ATTACK!; Center for Women War Victims; and the Association of Feminists.

In 2010 Iveković created The Right One. Pearls of Revolution, a group of ten pictures made with feminist photographer Sandra Vitaljić and

---

1. “The project started in Croatia and the war in former Yugoslavia clearly comprised the background of my interest in these stories. The sex industry in Bangkok is the background for the stories of the women there, but there is also perhaps [an] unexpected level of domestic violence in the wealthy liberal democracy of Luxembourg. You may say that the project bears witness to the continued and unceasing level of violence against women in our societies, West and East, North and South. Each case may have its ‘local’ character, but the ‘universal’ is the violence. Violence against women is regrettably a ‘universal’—not in the sense of a ‘transcendent’ characteristic—since the reasons for this violence vary hugely—but in terms of a common ‘universal’ condition that women invariably experience in patriarchal societies. We know that violence against women is not confined to any class, race or creed. In this work I wanted to redraw the ‘universal’ in such a way that, even though we are witnessing particular cases, we are forced to reflect on the values in our own culture and society rather than merely distancing ourselves from this problem as something that happens to ‘others’ or in ‘other cultures.’ Iveković, in Katarzyna Pabijanek, “Women’s House: Sanja Iveković Discusses Recent Projects,” ARTMargins, December 20, 2009, www.artmargins.com/index.php/interviews/541-qomens-houseq-sanja-ivekovic-discusses-recent-projects-interview.
sociologist and urban activist Jana Šarinić. In each large-scale color picture, Šarinić faces the camera, her left eye covered by an archival photograph of two Yugoslavian partisans performing the revolutionary gesture of saluting with fist held to the temple. Šarinić, too, rehearses this now-forgotten salute, making the gesture with a hand that also holds a string of pearls, seducing the viewer into examining the differences between the gestures, from one picture to the other, in order to determine which is “the right one.” Iveković’s critique of image-based consumer capitalism, with its philosophy of living in the moment, is here used to expose mechanisms of collective forgetfulness.

In 1998, for the Zagreb Salon, Iveković created Shadow Report, a project using an annual report produced by various European nongovernmental organizations on the infringement of women’s rights in Croatia. She printed the document on red paper, mounted its cover page for wall display, and left the remaining sheets crumpled into irregular balls and scattered in corners and around the perimeter of Zagreb’s Galerija Klovićevi dvori. The printed sheets look like trash, but Iveković succeeds in mobilizing the report’s activist potential, turning it, as Lucy Lippard has pointed out, “into an agitation leaflet.” Those who pick up the sheets, discarded as such leaflets often are, learn about the uncertain status of female refugees, the lack of protection for trafficking victims, and the violence of honor killings—brutal acts that continue to happen in contemporary times.

For her exhibition at The Museum of Modern Art, New York, Iveković has produced Report on CEDAW U.S.A., a similar installation based on a communiqué drawn from Amnesty International’s literature on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), a comprehensive agreement, adopted by the United Nations in 1979 and endorsed by 186 countries, for the abolition of all forms of discrimination against women. As of May 2011 the United States is still among the minority of countries, including Iran and Sudan, that have not yet ratified CEDAW. Here Iveković pressures us to respond and take responsibility for society’s progress, or lack thereof, in eradicating persistent forms of gender violence.


Fig. 1. Iveković prepares Turkish Report (2009), one of six versions to date of Shadow Report (1998), at the International Istanbul Biennial.
Anka Bulatorae

Charged with anti-fascist activities. Tortured and executed in Kostajnica in 1942. Age at the time of death: 36
Dragica Končar

Charged with anti-fascist activities. Tortured and executed in Zagreb in 1942. Age at the time of death: 27.
Ljubica Gerovac

Charged with anti-fascist activities. To avoid capture she committed suicide. Age at the time of death: 22
Nada Đimić

Charged with anti-fascist activities. Tortured and executed in Nova Gradiška in 1942. Age at the time of death: 19
Charged with anti-fascist activities. Arrested in Crikvenica in 1942 and taken to Auschwitz concentration camp from which she was freed in 1945. Age at the time of the arrest: 23
WOMEN’S HOUSE (SUNGLASSES)
MIHAELA
34, Serbian, married, two children
In the beginning I thought that his jealousy was a sign of love, so I ignored the violence. I loved him and believed that the violence would eventually stop. During the war, however, it became worse. I am Serbian and he is Muslim: my nationality became a new reason for him to abuse me. I went through hell. He brought home his war companions and forced me to kiss their boots while they called me a Serbian whore. After spending twelve days in the hospital, I decided to take my children and leave. I am in a shelter now, and I hope to change my life.
MERCEDES

35, Argentine, divorced, two children

I arrived in Venice without a job, and I then headed to Genoa, my destination. I found a job at a house where I worked for two years. I met Maurizio, we became engaged, and I brought over my daughter. We rented a flat with all the money that I had saved and moved in with his few possessions. Everything was going well until he began to mistreat my daughter. My mistake was letting him convince me that we needed a son; I should have gotten to know him better before having a child with him. I couldn’t take his ugly nature and bad behavior toward my daughter. I decided to leave and end everything because I wanted to avoid having my son become a person like his father. I know that with love and a lot of patience and sacrifice I will help my son become a valuable, respectable, and educated person.
SONIA

32, Russian, married, one child

I was a cheerful person. As a young girl I lived in Moscow, and my passion was dance. While I was on a tour with my dance company in Rome, I met my future husband and the father of my child. At first, I was happy; he was generous, mild-mannered, until we got married. Then he became jealous, possessive, and finally violent. I gave up everything just to avoid fighting with him. I existed solely for my family. I learned how to sew; I worked as a dressmaker. I stayed at home all the time, but even this was not enough to make his jealousy bearable. Meanwhile I had become pregnant and given birth, hoping that I would one day be able to return to dance. I found a job as a dance instructor in a school. It was very painful to get divorced and separate my son from his father. I would like to leave everything negative behind me and start over again as someone who has just arrived in Italy.
MARIA
56, Polish, married
I was studying to be a pharmacist. I graduated, found my first job, got married. I lived with my husband and parents in a two-room flat. I was afraid of unplanned pregnancy, and I tried to avoid it using the methods available. Those methods failed, and I got pregnant. I thought of it as my personal failure. I had no doubts about having an abortion, and I made an appointment with a private doctor. The procedure was performed in a living room that served as a gynecologist’s office on certain days. Later I looked after my mother for a couple of years until her death. It was only on her deathbed that my mother revealed to me the deadly sin on her conscience: she had terminated a pregnancy. When she went to confession right after the abortion, the priest did not react at all.
35, Italian, married, two children

When I was sixteen I met Giovanni, my great love, with whom I have a daughter. After a while I discovered that he was a drug addict. He dragged me down with him. The child-protection agents took our daughter away, but I decided to get sober and fight to get my child back. Three years later I married another man; I gave birth to my son, Adam, and got my daughter back. I seemed to be the happiest woman in the world, but then the cultural differences between my Algerian husband and me began to appear. He beat me, and I forgave him because he was drunk, but only until I discovered he was also assaulting my daughter. He begged for forgiveness, but I took my daughter from his house and installed her in a safe place. I stayed with him for two more months, but he got more and more violent. That last time he almost beat me to death; if I hadn't called the police, I think he would have killed me. I am here in the shelter now, and despite all my anger and pain, I still haven't lost hope. I have the strength to begin a new life with my children.
FIRUZE

45, Turkish, divorced, two children

I was born into an unhappy marriage. My parents’ unsteady love and up-and-down relationship made my siblings and me unhappy. My mother died giving birth to another baby. When my father got remarried, I couldn’t live with my stepmother. I quit school and got married. This getaway marriage ruined my life. I was subjected to various kinds of violence depending on my husband’s mood. I had two sons and devoted myself to raising them. I loved being a woman in spite of all the humiliations. I loved growing my hair long, but during my marriage I always kept it short to reduce the damage my husband could do. One day I decided I had had enough—I didn’t have to live this harsh life. I wanted my freedom. I abandoned my husband. By chance I came across Mor Çati, where I had my first experience of female solidarity and psychological support. I got divorced and gained my freedom. Now we women support each other, and I want to make sure Mor Çati will always be there for others.
THE RIGHT ONE. PEARLS OF REVOLUTION
REPORT ON CEDAW U.S.A.
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)

TREATY FOR THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN

The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW, or the Treaty for the Rights of Women), was adopted by the United Nations in 1979, and is the most comprehensive international agreement on the basic human rights of women. CEDAW provides an international standard for protecting and promoting women’s human rights and is often referred to as a “Bill of Rights” for women. It is the only international instrument that comprehensively addresses women’s rights within political, civil, cultural, economic, and social life.

As of April 2011, 186 countries had ratified CEDAW. The United States is one of only seven countries that have yet to ratify CEDAW, including Iran and Sudan. The United States has the dubious distinction of being the only country in the Western Hemisphere and the only industrialized democracy that has not ratified this treaty.

Tool for Change

CEDAW is a tool that women around the world are using effectively to bring about change in their conditions. In nations that have ratified the treaty, CEDAW has proved invaluable in opposing the effects of discrimination, which include violence, poverty, lack of legal protections, along with the denial of inheritance, property rights, and access to credit.

U.S. Ratification of CEDAW

The principles espoused in CEDAW are consistent with those in US law and with our country’s foreign and domestic policy objectives. CEDAW would nonetheless help efforts to enhance U.S. laws with respect to violence against women, access to legal protections, and other human rights. Lack of U.S. ratification serves as a disincentive for governments to uphold CEDAW’s mandate and their obligations under it to end discrimination against women. With U.S. ratification, the Women’s Convention would become a much stronger instrument in support of women’s struggles to achieve full protection and realization of their rights.

Hesitancy to ratify this important document stems from unfounded fears associated with the implementation of CEDAW in the U.S.
Sanja Iveković (Croatian, born 1949)
Graduated from The Academy of Fine Arts, Zagreb, 1970
Lives and works in Zagreb, Croatia

Selected Solo Exhibitions and Performances
1970 Student Center Gallery, Zagreb
1977 Un’ onore, Galeria del Cavallino, Arte Fiera, Bologna

Video: Ivkoivos, Martinis, Tribuljak, Referatni centar, Zagreb
1978 1st Belgrade Performance, Gallery SKC, Belgrade
1979 Double Life, Western Front, Vancouver
1980 Telal, The Franklin Furnace, New York
1981 Nessie, Studio of the Contemporary Art Gallery, Zagreb
1982 Town-Crier, Contemporary Art Gallery, Zagreb
1983 Romeo is Julliet, Salerno, Italy
1984 Video Viewpoints (with Dalibor Martinis), Institute of Contemporary Arts, London
1986 Center for Film, Zagreb
1990 New Works by S. Ivekovic and D. Martinis, Center for Film, Zagreb
1993 Bijelo stanjie, Gallery ULUPUH, Zagreb

Video Retrospective (with Dalibor Martinis), Gallery YYZ, Toronto

1994 Frozen Images, Long Beach Museum of Art, California
Mother’s Tongue, Gallery 21, St Petersburg, Russia
Resnik, Artists Space, Winnipeg
Video by Sanja Ivkoivos, Ace Art Inc., Winnipeg

1996 Nestablinsl slike, Galeria Rigo, Novigrad Cittanova, Croatia
Rani hrvatski video, Art Kino, Zagreb

1997 Meeting Point, Sarajevo Center for Contemporary Arts
1998 Delivering Facts, Producing Tears, ROOT ’98, Hull Time Based Arts, Hull, UK
Lice jezika, Attack, Ribnjak Park, Zagreb
1999 Blind Date, Galeria Škuc, Ljubljana, Slovenia
Repetito Est Mater, Galeria Otok, ARL, Dubrovnik, Croatia

2000 S.O.S. Nada Dimic, Galeria Karas, Zagreb
2001 Personal Cuts, Galerie im Taxispalais, Innsbruck, Austria; Neue Gesellschaft für Bildende Kunst, Berlin (2002)
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