

Miško Šuvaković

CCF

**CRITICAL CONTEMPORARY
FORMS
AND
A DESIRE FOR DEMOCRACY**

2008

INDEXES:

**LIFE,
CONTEMPORARITY, PHILOSOPHY,
THEORY,
SOCIETY,
POWER,
CULTURE,
REPRESENTATION,
DIRECT ACTION
AND
ART IN THE ERA**

**OF (ANTI)
GLOBALISM**

CONTENTS:

The thesaurus and directory of contemporary-life politics

Agamben, Giorgio

AIDS

AIDS politics, society, culture and art

Activism

Alternatives within the empire

America

Americanisation

Analysis of culture in the context of cultural studies

Anti-americanism

Anti-globalism i anti-globalisation

Right-wing anti-globalism

Arendt, Hannah

Benjamin, Walter

Bio-politics

Delleuze, Gilles

Form of life

Foucault, Michel

Globally, globalism and globalisation

Guattari, Felix

Hall, Stuart

Hardt, Michael

Ideology

Internet

Critical theory

Critical theory of the Frankfurt School

Multitude

Power

National realism

Nancy, Jean-Luc

Negri, Antonio

Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism and art

New media in art

The signifier

Signifying practice

Post-socialism and transition

The First World

Radical democracy

Cyberspace

Singularity

Cultural studies

Sovereignty

Terorrism

The Third World

The Third World in the First World

Art in the Age of Culture

Art in the Age of Terrorism

Art in a lingering state

Virno, Paolo

World Music

Zapatistas, digital

Life

Žižek, Slavoj

This book can be read from different positions of understanding, experiences, living, events and interpretations of 'contemporarity', but there is one characteristic and visible platform from which it is written: this is the platform of permanent *state of emergency*. The writer of these lines could say, similar to those who have 'strongly' experienced differences and conflicts of the 20th century: my life unwound and is unwinding between public and private – the depicted and the undepicted – in a permanent *state of emergency*: communist revolutions, self-governed freedoms from bureaucratic communism, crises of real-socialism, transitional primary accumulations of capital, nationalistic hysterically-paranoid proscription and executing of global neo-liberalism. This is something which cannot be overcome even with good intentions nor by cheery disposition, it is something which is always played out with consequences. This is why there is a recurrence, in the lines of the *letter* which follows, with the only weapons which modern man has been able to build-up in his resistance to a *permanent state of emergency*: and this is a minimum of rationality, a critical approach and radical analysis.

The tradition of the oppressed teaches us that a 'state of emergency' in which we live in is the norm. We have to reach a concept of history which suits this (Walter Benjamin).

I would like to get out of the bottle just like that fly which was taught this by Ludwig Wittgenstein in his *Philosophical Research*, but I am afraid that by coming out of 'my' bottle I will find myself in some other bigger or smaller bottle which will once again be mine and for me, for us and for the other 'lives'. If I am always caught in space and time of supervision, control and regulation – burnt ships behind me from adolescent pirate stories remain just a spectre of child fictions and commercial prose – then, carrying out minimum rationality, a critical approach and radical analysis remains the means which 'keeps' a precarious hope in place of broken class-based and ethnic 'utopias' about God's graciousness, the Heavenly Kingdom, the island of humaneness, brotherhood, equality and freedom, about socialism, about communism, about individual freedoms and liberalism.

But, towards what are minimum rationality, a critical approach and radical analysis oriented? Definitely towards that which is caught – meta-physically and existentially – between the undepicted, mute life and the depicted, enunciated life. What is 'that' in a trap? That which will maybe be recognised, i.e. named as 'life'. In other words, there will be word of a *state of emergency* in which 'life' is played out in all evasions and approaches within the events of contemporarity. This is a desire for democracy.

The thesaurus and directory of contemporary life politics

Giorgio Agamben, 1942 was an Italian philosopher. He studied philosophy at the University of Rome. His thesis was on the political philosophy of Simone Weil. He attended the lectures of the German philosopher Martin Heidegger: *Le Thor seminar* in 1966, and in 1968 on Heraclites and Hegel. He lectures at the *Universita IUAV di Venezia* and at the *College International de Philosophie* in Paris. He also lectures at American and German universities. He works on aesthetics, philosophical analysis of aesthetics and philosophy, as well as legal and political philosophy. His philosophical work was greatly influenced by Martin Heidegger, Walter Benjamin, Hannah Arendt and Carl Schmitt. Agamben derived his philosophy of politics from studying Benjamin, Arendt, and above all Michel Foucault, as well as Italian neo-Marxist theory and societal practices. His thorough analytical and interpretive philosophical penetration is published in the book: *Homo Sacer- Sovereign Power and Naked Life* (Italy, 1995). One of his basic philosophical fascinations was the one about 'holy life' (*homo sacer*) i.e. about the man who could kill himself without this being treated as neither a crime nor ritual sacrifice. Likewise, there is the question of a 'naked life' which precedes or stays behind the introduction and representation of life – for example the life of a man, woman or child in a concentration camp. According to him, a concentration camp is a place of 'naked life'. In one interview he wrote: "Yes, every attempt at reconstructing the political space of the West must begin with a clear knowledge about that so that we no longer know anything about the classical differentiation between *zoe* and *bios*, between private and public life, between man as a simple creature, whose place is in the home, and man as a political subject, whose place is in the city. From the concentration camp there is no return to classic politics. In the concentration camp our possibility of differentiating between our biological and political bodies, between the indescribable-inarticulate and describable-articulate life, is taken away." Agamben was able to directly confront Jacques Derrida's closure in text and interpretation of life in post-modern theory, as representations between presentations. He once again brought out philosophical attention to things outside of the book: *life*. In a methodological sense, Agamben used the concepts of state, society and human life, completely differently from Hannah Arendt and Walter Benjamin, who used Foucault's concept of analytical power and specific structural models of executing power such as 'biopolitics' in the 17th and 18th centuries. By stepping away from Foucault's abstract comprehension of 'biotechnology' towards *biotechnologies*, *biopowers*, and *biopolitics*, in actual historical and materialistic societies and states, Agamben showed a new philosophical approach: access of *biopolitics* as materialistic philosophies of human historical and actual life. He applied his critical theory on modern social processes as well, most notably on the permanent state of emergency which the West finds itself in, in the stage of global capitalism.

Literature: Giorgio Agamben: *Infancy and History – the Destruction of Experience* (Verso, 2007); *Language and Death: The Place of Negativity* (University of Minnesota Press, 1991); *Stanzas: Word and Phantasm in Western Culture* (University of Minnesota Press, 1993); *Homo sacer – Suverena moć i goli život* (Multimedijalni institut, 2006); *The Man without Content* (Stanford University Press, 1999); *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy* (Stanford University Press, 2000); *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive* (Zone Books, 2002); *The Open: Man and Animal* (Stanford University Press, 2004); *State of Exception* (The University of Chicago Press, 2005).

AIDS is the abbreviation for the syndrome one gets with a decrease in immunity (*Acquired immune deficiency syndrome* or *Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome*).

AIDS is a combination of symptoms and infections which are a result of a 'breakdown' of the immune system caused by HIV (Human immunodeficiency virus = a virus which weakens the body's immunity) or similar viruses (SIV, FIV). In the late phase the patient is exposed to various infections and tumours. To date, there is no medical treatment which leads to the cure of the effects of such viruses. The virus is transmitted through direct contact with bodily fluids (blood, semen, vaginal secretion, mother's milk, etc.) According to statistics of various medical organisations (*Joint United Nations Programme/UNAIDS/* and the *World Health Organisation/WHO*) AIDS has taken the lives of nearly 25 million people from when it was first identified on June 5, 1981. There are various theses on the origins of the HIV virus and its 'cousins'. Many scientists believe that the HIV virus originated in sub-Saharan Africa and that it appeared during the 20th century. From the 38,6 million people who are currently infected with the HIV virus, nearly a third of them are living in sub-Saharan Africa. There are also theories that the HIV virus is from an earlier time but that it began circulating globally only towards the end of the 20th century, as well as the viewpoint that the HIV virus is not a 'natural organism' but that it is an organism which was made in military laboratories during the end of the Cold War. Along with tuberculosis and cancer, AIDS is the third biggest global illness of the modern age, but unlike tuberculosis and cancer, AIDS is not an illness of an organ or part of the organism, it is an illness of the human immune system and therefore an 'appearance' which hurries the occurrence of specific and local illnesses on/in the human body.

Literature: Suzan Sontag, *SIDA i njene metafore* (Dečje novine, 1990); [Tony Barnett](#) , [Alan Whiteside](#), *AIDS in the Twenty-First Century: Disease and Globalization* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

AIDS politics, society, culture and art are connected to the unified societal processes of identification, interpretation and understanding AIDS as a global epidemic. Every illness is a social occurrence and as such is not just a case of a 'sick individual' or 'objectivity' or a 'rational medical system'. Rather it is an occurrence inside societal relationships and structures, and therefore a classification of technology turned on and turned off from society. As a cultural occurrence, every illness has its own cultural intermediaries and artistic situations. In the West, AIDS appeared as an illness inside highly promiscuous groups, most notably among homosexual individuals and groups. That is how public opinion has formed and has been divided about AIDS and people who have AIDS from the time that AIDS was discovered. At one point, during the 1980's, this division brought on mass homophobia and with it the tendency to exclude homosexuals from public life, which is when other groups, also exposed to the dangers of the AIDS virus, were neglected. The appearance of homophobia connected to AIDS coincided with the great societal movement to the right, which was initiated by the weakening of the block division of the world, the strengthening of the local and regional right, the triumph of liberal politics and the appearance of post-modern culture and art. In other words, AIDS homophobia was a move to the right and the re-establishment of neo-conservative concepts of public and social life.

The mythologisation of the illness as the universal symbol was attributable to art and literature of the late 19th century and the first half of the 20th century, when tuberculosis became the symbol of death. A similar pre-occupation with an illness happened with AIDS in the 1980's. AIDS affected the art scene, especially the New York art scene. In artistic post-modern works, AIDS is characterized dually: (1) as the

universal symbol of the totality of an inescapable death, analogous to tuberculosis; (2) the emancipating depiction of AIDS as an illness which not only refers to the risky social groups (homosexuals, drug abusers, haemophiliacs) but is a problem to society as a whole. The Canadian group *General Idea*, for example, made some works of art which problematise the symbolisation of AIDS in culture at the end of the 1980's and beginning of the 1990's. The picture *AIDS* was created as a parody from the famous pop-artist icon Robert Indiana's picture *Love*. Members of the group copied Indiana's picture, but instead of the word "love" wrote the word "AIDS". Their second work was an installation of giant copies of pills used as a treatment for those suffering from AIDS (1991). Derek Jarman made the movie *Blue* (1993), which throughout its 75 minutes shows a blue screen. The blue on the screen is accompanied by a voice which talks about suffering from AIDS, dying and death: "My retina is distanced from the planet. I am living this scenario for six years... My sight will never return... The virus is progressing, I have no friends anymore... I have lost my sight... I will not win the fight against the virus... I am helpless. I cannot see it. Only sound. In the chaos of pictures I adduce this picture of blue". During the 1990's and the beginning of the 21st century, various artistic strategies, tactics and suitable platforms are being developed which are directed at the *artivistic* dealing with AIDS. Moreover, AIDS is no longer treated just as an illness, individual human drama or homophobic reaction, but like a system of political strategies and tactics of intervention in the global world. By this, the exit from the specificity of the American art scene and its confrontations with republican conservatism is marked, as well as the entrance into global presentation of AIDS into totally specific societies and cultures, such as southern African society, the societies of Mozambique, Uganda, Zambia, Thailand, China or Brazil. Like this, the politics of artistic work on the *phenomenology* of AIDS become politics of global intervention with all of their local differences, consequences and narratives.

In a stricter political sense, AIDS is now a global problem, and for the African continent and mankind, a dramatic challenge for the survival of the human race. Furthermore, – treatment, control, prevention and curing AIDS are not only a matter of medicinal science, they are also a question of economical-political control of human life through the control of AIDS' treatments and cures. Finally, the politics of AIDS are tangled with the politics of neo-conservatism and the re-establishment of religious fundamentalism which paints a controversial, catastrophic picture of the modern world.

Literature: Marina Gržinić, „Histerija: fizičko prisustvo, pravno odsustvo, i AIDS: fizičko odsustvo, pravno prisustvo“, iz *Avangarda i politika – Istočnoevropska paradigma i rat na Balkanu* (Beogradski krug, 2005); Douglas Crimp, *AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism* (The MIT Press, 1988), Tyrus Miller, „AIDS and Artistic Politics“ (Ankara, 2007); Paula Treichler, *How to have Theory in an Epidemic: Cultural Chronicles of AIDS* (Duke University Press, 2006).

Activism is a shape of deliberate fact which establishes a conceptual and pragmatic platform of the role of initiative, interventive and interactive behaviour and acting in society, politics, culture and art. By activism it is meant that by deliberate fact one can come to social and political change. In the conceptual sense there are three characteristic activist approaches that can be differentiated: (a) the approach based on the belief that initiatives, interventions, and interactions are "practical" neo-theoretical activities which emerge from conflicts and contradictions from the dominant experienced societal situations, (b) the approach based on the belief that initiatives, interventions and interactions are practical activities which precede every conceptual or theoretical judgment of society, culture or art- so that they are the

criterion of “truth” or “goodness” for every concept or theory, and (c) the approach based on the belief that initiatives, interventions and interactions are concrete, practical and pragmatic realisations of established idealised, abstract concepts or theories about society, culture and art. What is portrayed as important in the history of activism is that activism is established as a societal, cultural or art practice just through agreed inter-relations of activist facts and theoretical predictions of activism.

The concept “activism” is anticipated and derived from the industrial revolution and the first “active resistance” from workers of the industrial, capitalistic exploitation from the 18th century to date. The term “activism” appears in Belgian newspapers in 1916 in relation to the *Flamingant* movement- the Belgian movement for the fight for greater Flemish authority throughout Belgium. The term activism, also appears in the name of the Hungarian avant-garde art movement, “Hungarian activists” (*Magyar aktivizmus*) gathered around the writer Kassak Lajos, 1887-1967. He was the first great writer and artist from the working class in Hungarian culture. Activism is also connected with feminist activism, human rights activism, revolutionary activism in communist revolutions, in inter-revolutionary conflicts (Maoist activism), activism connected with the workings of religious movements – Christian activism, Islamic activism, etc.

The concepts of political, cultural and artistic activism take completely different shapes from the individual fact, through different practices of self-organisation to informal or formal institutionalised workings. The types of activism are shown through protests in the form of writings in public newspapers, electronic media, institutions, or in politicians through cultural campaigns, to political, societal, economic, i.e. natural, racial, class acts in public marches, strikes, protests or guerrilla actions. Activism can be left-wing (syndicate activism, socialist activism, communist activism) or right-wing (Fascist activism, national-socialist activism, religious activism, nationalistic activism, racial activism) oriented depending on what political goals it tends towards. Cultural activism is not aimed so much at a protest against the government as much as it is aimed towards changing public opinion in society and culture. For example, changing the dominant attitude in public opinion about racial, national or natural identity, and therefore the relationship towards ecological society, etc. Self-organised activism appears as a tendency towards the formation of “different” or “independent”, that is, alternative *platforms* or *para-institutions* in society, culture, and art. Artistic activism is most often based on avant-garde in the transition from the 19th to 20th century until the *art in the age of culture* in the transition from the 20th to the 21st century. Artistic activism most often appears when the shapes of behaviour from societal, political and cultural intervention and interactive workings transfer and bring artistic work into the domain, i.e. when artistic work as a completed “piece” is replaced with a presentation of open and visible interventions and interactive artistic practices in specific contexts. One of the first appearances of culturally-artistic activism, was the French and international situationism of the late sixties. Situationists tended towards active and subversive interventions and interactive workings in the context of popular public mass culture of developed capitalism.

In an era of globalism, activism develops in wide diapasons from *living activism* to *net activism*. This division is not substantial, metaphysical, a distinction between differentiating direct *live* facts from *surreal internet* facts, but instead shows the difference of the human body’s relationship towards societal intervention and interaction. *Live activism* is connected to physical space of the body’s human individual behaviour, while *net activism* always mediates the physical space of the

body's human individual behaviour through digital means of communicating facts, and thus also "active situations". This division does not exclude the observation that both *live activism* and *net activism* are societal material practices of modern-structured societies. The concepts of activism in any shape or mode of carrying out the initiative, intervention and interaction are connected to the anti-global economic, societal, political, communicative, cultural and 'resistance' practices towards global capitalism and economic globalisation of capital in relation to the political globalisation of power.

Literature: Douglas Crimp, *AIDS: Cultural Analysis, Cultural Activism* (The MIT Press, 1988); [Steven M. Buechler](#), *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism* (Oxford University Press, 1999); Marina Gržinić (ed), *The Real, The Desperate, The Absolute – Essays on Art Systems, Narratives of Power, Strategies of Implosion, Perspectives on Disasters, Objects as Monsters and Activism* (Galerija sodobne umetnosti, 2001); [Randy Shaw](#), *The Activist's Handbook: A Primer Updated Edition with a New Preface* (University of California Press, 2001); T McDonough (ed), *Guy Debord and the Situationist International – Texts and Documents*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2002; Marina Gržinić, *Situated Contemporary Art Practices – Art, Theory and Activism from (the East of) Europe* (Revolver, Založba ZRC, 2004); [Amanda Sussman](#), *The Art of the Possible: A Handbook for Political Activism* (McClelland & Stewart, 2007).

Alternatives within the empire. Alternatives within the empire are possible as scopes of otherness, polygons of subversion and potential critical thinking and activity. Alternatives within the empire are possible as practices of critical and activist rearrangement of an unproblematic implied relationship between singularity and universality, whereby it is 'taken care' that singularity does not slide into particularity and universality into totalitarianism. The existence of alternatives within the empire or within an imperial global system is not an easy way to confront 'globalism', according to Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt. Globalisation or de-territorialisation, with which "imperial machines" operate, does not confront localisation or re-territorialisation. Globalisation and territorialisation bring movable and adaptable circles of differentiation and identification into the picture. For Negri and Hardt the 'enemy' is not globalisation as a process, it is the defined regime of globalised relationships which calls itself the Empire. Strategies of local defence are harmful because they cloud the state of things and deny the real alternative and potential for freedom within the Empire. In a theoretical sense, this means that the alternative is denied from the empire's hegemonic and homogenising set-up of its own instrumental globalising power, as well as the local defences of territorialisation which show themselves as reducing singularity in a multitude in isolated particularities against the empire. Imperialities and localisations are against the alternative in a multitude because they deny the democratic potential of multiplicity. On the contrary, if alternative practices are alternatives to the empire and localisations, they pre-orient the field of homogenisation towards anti-fields of hybridisation. Negri and Hardt stress: "Today, a manifest, a political discourse, should lean towards fulfilling Spinoza's prophet-like function, the function of an imminent wish which organises the multitude. At the end, there is no determinism or utopia: this is more of a radical counter-power, ontologically determined not on any 'vide pour le futur' but on the real activity of the multitude, its creation, production and power – materialistic theology." In a practical sense, which is – definitely – interpreted by theoretical practices, it stands that alternatives within the empire are exactly those shapes of self-organised 'resistance' by which the world transforms and shows itself as a multiplicity shaping life here and there in a way of real democracy for the multitude. A real democracy for the multitude should not be a democracy in a direct voting right where the subject only and continually votes for this and that. Democracy should be a new paradigm with which the multitude can confront new

forms of power and rule on a global and local level. This is about resistance to sovereignty in favour of democracy, which means resistance to every spreading of state sovereignty. The strategy of theoretical practice and practical theory about the multitude, crucially points out that a unified multitude and the subordination of differences is purposefully avoided. This is why we speak of a multitude of sex, race, ethnicity and any other kind of identity in a bio-political context: "The multiplicity of the multitude does not only refer to being different but on becoming different. Becoming different from what we are! These singularities work together, and from there form a new race, namely, a politically-coordinated subjectivity which is produced by the multitude. The primary decision which the multitude produces is actually the decision to create a new race, or to put it better, a new mankind. Therefore, when love is understood politically, the creation of a new mankind is the highest act of love!" (Negri and Hardt).

Literature: Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, „Alternative unutar imperija“, iz *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003, str. 48-67); Micahel Hardt, Antonio Negri, „Multitude – War and Democracy in the Age of Empire“ (Penguin Books, 2004); Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, „Politika mnoštva“ (*Tvrđa* br. 1-2, 2005, str. 70-93).

America- (The North-American continent, the United States of America/USA) in post-modern discussions is an allegory for the new world, the promised land, the new centre of culture and art, a world atomic power, the only superpower after the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the complete realisation of post-modern civilisation.

America re-establishes itself as the new centre of culture and art in the late thirties, when a large number of European avant-garde artists and intellectuals come to the US: Moholy-Nagy László, Piet Mondrian, Joseph and Anni Albers, Xanti Schavinsky, Fritz Lang, Thomas Mann, Vladimir Nabakov, André Bréton, Henri Masson and others. During the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's, the theory and practice of American modernism (in painting, poetry, prose and film), as well as a new international language, is restored. Many authors, especially left-leaning ones, speak of American highly modern art as the new imperial hegemony in culture and art. The hegemony of American art lasts until the end of the 1970's, when the post-modern eclectic turn with trans-avant-garde and neo-expressionism arrives (the return of historical values to European painting). In the mid-1980's, the domination of American art once again spreads from neo-geo painting to techno aesthetics (techno poetry, techno theatre, simulation, virtual spaces).

It is characteristic that post-structural university and critical theory from Roland Barthes and Jacques Lacan to Julia Christeve and Jacques Derrida to Jean Baudrillard, Giles Deleuze, Felix Guattari or Paul Virilio becomes the theory of post-modernism only with the transmission from European intellectual to American productive, consumer and informative contexts of mass culture. Post-structural theory in the European context is a critical post-linguistic and post-semiological theory which transforms critical referential text into textuality as a shape of developing significance, sense, value and ideology. Post-structural theory in US culture is in fact, post-modern theory whose uncontrolled textual productivity astonishingly coincides with the eruptive productive and consumer existence of late American capitalism. What represents historical pre-determined ideology in European culture, is actual mass culture and pre-determined production and consumption in the American sphere (goods and information).

For Jean Baudrillard, *America* is an allegorical picture of unreal hyper-real society, resembling a gigantic hologram because the total information is contained in every individual work. In the text, *America*, he goes through her registers of space,

time, travel, exhibition, seduction, obscenity, eroticism, production and consumption, in order to establish an explicitly different model of society from the homogenous society, the condensed and historical connection, as is found between eastern and western European. The point of his argument is showing the distance from historical to present society, from modern to hyper-modern society, that is, from a culture of desire and searching for an object, to a desire for a culture of ecstatic and obscene consumption. The myth of Californian power is a mix of total freedom and mind-blowing mobility into a hyper-real scenario of desert, highways, oceans and sun: "Only here exists that shining link of radical rudeness and such natural beauty, the miracles of nature and absolute semblance..." America is portrayed as a "world" in which the clear differences between nature (the body), urban zones (metropolises such as Los Angeles) and the virtual screen pictures (imaginary electronic systems of communication) are being lost.

In the novel *Pacific Wall*, Jean François Lyotard talks about the illusion or wall of crystal which surrounds California in its own well-being. California is the *America of America* (America for America). While Barthes was speaking of Japan as the empire of signs, America can be seen as the empire of the determined. The totality of all produced and consumed powers, which spans from goods (objects) to spectacles (mass culture) to illusions (virtual electronic displays) is realized without history (the past) and without utopia (the future) as a whole lasting media-influenced future.

Literature: Achille Bonito Oliva, *Europe\America: The Different Avant-Gardes* (Deco Press, 1976); Charles Harrison, "Modernism and the Transatlantic Dialogue", Francis Frascina, *Pollock and After - The Critical Debate* (Harper & Row, 1985, str. 217-232); Germano Celant, *Un-Expressionism - Art Beyond the Contemporary* (Rizzoli, 1988); Roland Barthes, *Carstvo znakova* (August Cesarec, 1989); Jean-Francois Lyotard, *Pacific Wall* (The Lapis Press, 1989); Stephanie Barron (ed), *Entartete Kunst. Das Schicksal Der Avantgarde im Nazi - Deutschland* (LACMA i Deutsch Historisches Museum - Hirmer Verlag, 1991); Žan Bodrijar, *Fatalne strategije* (Književna zajednica Novog Sada, 1991); Slavoj Žižek (ed), *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Lacan (But were Afraid to Ask Hitchcock)* (Verso, 1992); Žan Bodrijar, *Amerika* (Buddy Books & Kontekst, 1993); Žan Bodrijar, *Prozirnost zla - Ogledi o krajnosnim fenomenima* (Svetovi, 1994); Sylvère Lotringer, Sande Cohen (eds), *French Theory in America* (Routledge, 2001).

Americanisation is a project of imitating, hegemonising and becoming similar, close or exemplarily connected to real or fictional notions of America (USA). There is a difference between some referential historical models of presenting "Americanism" and "Americanisation". The American Revolution as a symbolic field of liberal, urban and bourgeois revolution in constituting the ideals of the *New World*. The American "Declaration of Independence" and the "Constitution of the United States" are created as an affirmation of 'new human power' against transcending power. The concept Americanism appears in France around 1860 and signifies American social influences. The American totalising and accelerated, developmental, productive, exchangeable and consumer transfiguration of a vertical bourgeois-class capitalism into a consumer-horizontal capitalism of society in abundance. The word "Americanism" in a socio-economic sense, was used between two world wars as an era of expansive modernisation and mass production development and a totalisation of the global market. In a cultural sense, "Americanism" signified the eclectic presentation of heterogeneous cultural identities and their presentations as *modern identities*. After the Second World War "Americanism" signified one of the poles of power in a binary, so-called "Cold War" divide between the *liberal West* (NATO) and the *realkommunist East* (Warsaw Pact). In such a bi-polar divide, 'America' was one of the symbolic presentations of a *free liberal world* against a closed and totalitarian real communism in the East. The concept of Americanism and Americanisation is shown throughout the Cold War in several ways: as a negative characterisation by

which dissident or pro-Western activities within the Eastern block are classified, wherefore as the ideal of “complete freedom and well-being” for dissidents in the East, as a paradoxal system of internal contradictions between the proclaimed radical liberalism and the imperialistic state politics of the United States from the 1950’s until the 1980’s, but also as a model of the plural post-modern plural society of late capitalism, and also as a characteristic representative model of the new Empire or *New Rome* after the break-up of the USSR and the completion of the block divide of the world. With the ‘events’ from September 11, 2001, i.e. the terrorist attacks on the USA - which was symbolically characterised by the destruction of the Twin Towers, (the World Trade Centre), - ‘America’ becomes a representative of a militant, imperial, economic, political and army-connected practice on a global scale, i.e. a world scale. The imperialism of US politics can be seen in the most basic strategies of re-shaping free world space and the new set-up of different and unrepeatable relationships in networks with unlimited terrains.

Literature: Frederic Jameson, *Post-modernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Verso, 1992); Žan Bodrijar, *Amerika* (Buddy Books & Kontekst, 1993); Slavoj Žižek, *Welcome to the Desert of the Real* (Verso, 2002); Antoni Negri, Michael Hardt, „Umreženost moći: suverenost SAD-a i Novi Imperij“, iz *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003, str. 141-158); Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, „Multitude – War and Democracy in the Age of Empire“ (Penguin Books, 2004); Barry Rubin, [Understanding Anti-Americanism](#) (Foreign Policy Research Institute, August 2004); Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, „Politika mnoštva“ (*Tvrda* br. 1-2, 2005, str. 70-93); Slavoj Žižek, *Irak – Posuđeni čajnik* (Naklada Ljevak, 2005).

An analysis of culture in the context of studying culture is a critical procedure of researching, interpreting and analysis of culture as a practice for production, exchange and consumer value. For the study of culture it is relevant to theoretically place the concept of ‘culture’ in a wider context of meaning which relates to high culture/art and every-day life. Raymond Williams gave a three-way definition of culture: first, culture is an ‘ideal’ by which *human perfection* is established in the sense of distinct and absolute value, which creates a timeless comparison and, with this, has a fixed relationship towards the *universal human condition*; secondly, culture is envisaged as the *body* of intellectual and imaginative work through which the various experiences and knowledge of people is kept; and thirdly, culture is a description and demonstration of different ways within every-day social life.

In cultural studies, one does not purposefully conduct a differentiation and exclusion or inclusion in specific cultural formations, like one for example, excludes questions of popular art in aesthetics and philosophy of art. High culture, autonomous high culture, popular culture, mass culture, consumer culture, entertainment culture or every-day culture, are merely cases which are questioned with respected autonomy and relationships of different autonomies inside cultural formations. Studies of culture are based on inter-disciplinary approaches of *cultural formations* by procedures such as collageing, mapping and theoretical confrontations: Marxist cultural theories, critical theories of the cultural industry, Gramsci’s theories of hegemony, Lefebvre’s philosophies of every-day life, structuralism, semiotics/semiology, post-structuralism, above all Althusser’s ideological philosophies, Barthes’ textual theories, Foucault’s theories of discourse and discursive analyses of power, Lacan’s psycho-analytical theories of subject, then, the study of representation, the study of the body, the study of identity, the study of sex, the study of popular and mass culture, the study of cultural institutions, the study of cultural practices and the study of the media. What is important for the definition of culture is that a double hybridism is found in its theory: hybridism of the studied

object, i.e. culture, and hybridism of the theory studied, i.e. a discourse of cultural analysis.

The term 'study' concurrently signifies: the academic level of theory and culture and the activist level of cultural practices in every-day life. The main difference between the *sociology of culture* and the study of culture is in the development of the 'object' and 'method' of study. In traditional modernistic sociology, social meta-horizons of every-day life are prefigured in relation to the base and outbuilding, and cultural studies research cultural practices of shaping and representing every-day life in specific and potentially limitless *semantic* differentiating cultural contexts and their institutionalisations. From the standpoint of methodology, the sociology of culture is established on the scientific basis of empirical and theoretical studying of culture. From the standpoint of methodology, cultural studies are developed as textual, post-semiological analyses of material cultural shapes which are shown and explained, that is, *signified*, which do not depend on the legitimacy of a meta-hierarchy and, perhaps, a humanitarian science. John Storey stresses that cultural studies, accorded to Raymond Williams, are an analysis of all forms of signification. And Williams' social definition of culture, based on the analysis of significations is as follows: "... this is a 'social' definition of culture; culture is the description of a specific way of life which explains certain connotations and values which are not only given to art and education, but rather in institutions and every-day behaviour. An analysis of culture, according to this definition, is an explanation of the connotations and values which are understood for an individual way of life. This kind of analysis will include... an analysis of the elements of the way of life which other definitions of culture will not take into account as 'culture': the organisation of production, family structure, the structure of institutions which explain or control social relationships, characteristic shapes with which members of society communicate in." With this definition we expand the cultural conception to materialistic formations, structural and institutional potential, every-day life, and therefore, the concepts of culture and concepts of significance are connected. Culture, according to Storey, depicts itself as a '*network of meaning*', i.e. culture as a signifying system. Under the *network of meaning* a process of connection and bringing meaning is understood: the meaning of *signification* is seen as a relationship and duplicating the relationship. If that is so, then the cultural studies of *telo theories* were established by producing inter-textual theoretical knowledge which is seen as a materialistic social or political practice among other social practices in culture. In cultural studies, knowledge is not a neutral or objective 'occurrence', rather it is a textual, i.e. *significant*, effect of positioning, the place from which one speaks, whom he speaks to, and what reasons he has to speak. Cultural studies are, it can be said, a *discursive formation*: 'cluster' thoughts, shows and practices which gather access to speech and protocols and procedures about carrying out knowledge and using that knowledge within social cultural activities or institutional positions.

Literature: Raymond Williams, *Writing and Society* (Verso, 1984); Mieke Bal, *Double Exposures – The Subject of Cultural Analysis* (Routledge, 1996); Džon Fisk, *Popularna kultura* (Clio, 2001); Inge E. Boer, Mieke Bal (eds), *The Point of Theory: Practices of Cultural Analysis* (Continuum, 2002); Terry Eagleton, *Ideja kulture* (Jasenski i Turk, 2002); Andrew Burn, David Parker, „Multimodality and Textual Analysis“, iz *Analysing Media Texts* (Continuum, 2003); John Storey, *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture – An Introduction* (Peking University Press, 2004); John Storey, *Cultural Turn in Literary Theory: Its Possibility & Impossibility* (Proceedings of 2005 Sino-West Forum on Literary Theory, 2005); Raymond Williams, „Analiza kulture“, iz Dean Duda (ed), *Politika teorije – zbornik rasprava iz kulturalnih studija* (Disput D.o.o, 2005, str. 35-59).

Anti-Americanism is the name given to diverse critiques, resistances, denials or negations of American society, economics, politics, culture and art. Anti-

Americanism has been around since the creation of the United States in different shapes and for different reasons. In principle, anti-Americanisms differ from rejecting American values and culture, that is, from different critical confrontations with American social, economic, political, cultural and art hegemonies, that is, a confrontation to particular historical positions of the United States government.

One of the first anti-American theories was the so-called 'degenerative thesis', describing the American continent as a place where the formation of civilization did not occur. The German philosopher, Cornelius de Pauw, who worked at the court of the Prussian king, Frederic II, set out the 'degenerative thesis' about the American continent in 1768. The basic assumption of this theory was that the natural environment of North America was such that it did not allow the development of true culture. The French encyclopaedist, Abbé Raynal, discussed this in a similar way. These theses were discussed by American philosophers and politicians of the time: Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson. The theory of American industrialisation was also developed, and from German romanticism of the 19th century no less, from Nikolaus Lenau and Friedrich Nietzsche to Martin Heidegger's critic of 'mechanics' in the mid-20th century. The French writer, Joseph Arthur Comte de Gobineau, set out a racial theory (the book: *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races*, 1853-1855), by which the 'new continent' was treated as a continent of lower and mixed races.

Anti-Americanism was expressed in French culture during the 20th century, above all, as part of the cultural imperialistic fight for international domination: the fight for *global* domination between the French and English languages. In France, after the Second World War, anti-Americanism was carried out as part of a political, economic and cultural struggle for preserving French imperial politics in Europe and further, and then, as a resistance to cultural Americanisation through popular culture, art and the entertainment industry. In totalitarian systems, such as Italian fascism, German Nazism, and Soviet realkommunism, anti-Americanisms were part of a unified political struggle for making international hegemonies and powers on a global scale. German and Italian anti-Americanisms were part of the war propaganda before and during the Second World War. Soviet anti-Americanism had a long history of conflicts between the two different political systems before the Second World War, and after the Second World War, re-structuralisation and de-territorialisation of the world into a 'block' world formation of two atomic superpowers came about. The Soviet official state anti-Americanism was parallel to the Soviet dissident anti-Americanism. Anti-Americanism in Cuba, China, Vietnam, Pol Pot's Cambodia, and other South-American states, was connected to the imperialistic, economic, political and militarily-interventive government of the United States from the 1950's until the late 1980's.

Anti-Americanism was connected to the restructuring of the bi-polar world's formation from the Cold War, into a 'monad' world imperial formation of the United States from the end of the 1980's, after the block divide of the world had been completed. Anti-Americanism can be displayed in different aspects:

- Anti-Americanism as a result of the creation of an 'empire' on the global scale which creates 'a new world formation' based on globalisation and politics of the neo-liberal free market
- Anti-Americanism as a resistance to the globalisation of American popular and media culture
- Anti-Americanism as a display of contradictions and confrontations by Islam and the Western world which is led by the United States government

- Anti-Americanisms in the third and second world, above all in societies which reinstate themselves in claustrophobic, i.e. closed national, ethnic and religious societies or state segments

- Anti-Americanisms in various neo, post or anti-globalisation left-wing practices in the first, second or third worlds

During the 1990's and the first decade of the 21st century, anti-Americanism is a consequence of unified and contradictory processes in the transformation of society, economy, technology, politics, culture and art of the Cold War world through a plural world of late capitalism and late socialism in a transitional world and a world of totalised globalisation. Unified and contradictory processes are marked by transformations of different strategic relationships between power on a global and local level (the war in Iraq, the war in the former Yugoslavia, political confrontations with Iran).

Literature: Roger, Phillippe. *The American Enemy: The History of French Anti-Americanism* (University of Chicago Press, 2005); James W. Ceaser, "A Genealogy of anti-Americanism" (http://www.travelbrochuregraphics.com/extra/a_genealogy_of_antiamericanism.htm); Brendon O'Conner "A Brief History of Anti-Americanism from Cultural Criticism to Terrorism" (Australasian Journal of American Studies, July 2004, str. 77-92); Antoni Negri, Michael Hardt, „Umreženost moći: suverenost SAD-a i Novi Imperij“, iz *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003, str. 141-158); Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, „Multitude – War and Democracy in the Age of Empire“ (Penguin Books, 2004); Barry Rubin, *Understanding Anti-Americanism* (Foreign Policy Research Institute, August 2004); Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, „Politika mnoštva“ (*Tvrda* br. 1-2, 2005, str. 70-93); Slavoj Žižek, *Irak – Posuđeni čajnik* (Naklada Ljevak, 2005).

Anti-globalism and anti-globalisation are terms which are used to describe political positions, practices, performances and situations which are theoretical, activist, and politically challenge economic and political globalisation, that is, globalist power. Anti-globalism is defined by political positions, that is, different political performances of individual, collective, connected, and globalised public or secret political struggles against the dominant 'world power system', i.e. completely different strategies and tactics of confrontation towards political, economic and social powers to large multi-national corporations, organisations, and institutions are appointed. From the anti-globalism viewpoint, the dominant world power system or the dominant world liberal (neo-liberal) systems of power shatter democratic political tendencies in the modern world, so they adopt existential spaces, control ecological conditions, violate the right to work, destroy national sovereignty and 'independence' of the second (post-socialist) and third (post-colonial) world.

Along with the term 'anti-globalism' as a collective name, names such as the *Global Justice Movement* or the *Movement of Movements* are pointed out. This is about global macro movements in which individuals, political groups, NGO organisations, and others cooperate. This movement confronts 'corporate globalism' and pledges for equality in the planetary realisation of economic rights and relationships. In other words, the global monopolism of multi-national large capitalism is confronted by the idea of plural globalisation which rejects global protectionisms and monopolisms in the name of global mobility of 'life' against the global mobility of 'capital'. These movements also pledge for 'fair trade' rules in public dealings. *Fair trade* is a social movement which promotes the standards for international social politics in the field of work and the work environment, and above all, the movement encourages exports from developing countries to developed countries. The *Global Justice Movement* confronts the politics of international 'license' organisations such as the *World Trade Organisation- WTO* which stand for liberal world organisations of trade. The important role of 'public dealing' and 'public practices' against the non-transparency of global and local centres of

economic and political power is then pointed out. The politics of anti-militarism are also crucial, as they are the instruments of capitalist expansion.

Anti-globalist organisations such as the *Global Justice Movement* or the *Movement of Movements* avoid or modify the name 'anti-globalism' because they stand for a 'global' and 'universal' transparent communication and participation in an equal and justified co-existence of mankind. These movements hinder and attack global expansion of corporate power, i.e. they stand for an anti-capitalistic universal perspective on globalisation. These movements encourage global international solidarity and connecting activists from the 'North' and 'South'. The *World Social Forum* was created by connecting mutual interventive platforms on a global scale. The key ethical convictions of these movements and their dynamic platforms are:

- global rights for all
- respecting the planet Earth
- progression towards abundance is possible
- creativity at work
- economic democracy

By this, these movements explicitly stress the difference between nationalistic, neo-conservative and fundamentally-oriented adversaries to a globalisation whose political strategies and tactics are based on conservative defence of national sovereignty and rigid religious identity. The movements organised large demonstrations of citizens and alternative congregations which referred to the manifestations of the global 'centres of power' such as the G8 summit, the WTO summit, the International Monetary Fund summit and the World Bank summit.

Literature: [Tom Mertes](#), Walden F. Bello, [Bernard Cassen](#), [Jose Bove](#), *A Movement of Movements: Is Another World Really Possible?* (Verso, 2004); [Jose Correa Leite](#), *The World Social Forum: Strategies Of Resistance* (Haymarket Books, 2005); Stefan Nowotny, "Postoji li svijet antiglobalizma?" (*Zarez* br. 192, 2006, str. 10-13); [Luis Alberto Fernandez](#), *Policing Dissent: Social Control and the Anti-globalization Movement (Critical Issues in Crime and Society)* (Rutgers University Press, 2008).

Right-wing anti-globalism is linked to converting social processes such as realkommunism and colonial affiliations, ethnic groups, societies and states, into independent, and above all, radically-nationalistic and religiously-controlled societies and states. Right-wing anti-globalism, most often, marks political platforms of closing societies and establishes *single-party* ethnic or national, that is, religious states. Fetishism in a closed and homogenous state is essentially linked to the revival of religious influence and role in societies after the post-modern. Right-wing anti-globalism is apparently created with the revival of the bourgeois, and in a national sense, with a structurally-integrated society. This apparentness is highlighted with right-wing rhetoric of particular traditionalism and political anti-Americanism, which is not aimed so much at the politics of the United States government, but rather at the essential concepts of western internationalism, cosmopolitanism and mundialism. The philosopher Chantal Mouffe points to the crisis of western democracies which emerges after the end of the block division of the world and the fall of the 'eastern block'. According to her, the fall of communism brought about an explosion of nationalism and the emergence of new antagonisms in many places. The democratic West found itself facing explosive ethnic, religious and nationalist conflicts which they believed were a thing of the past. Instead of a democratised new world order with the triumph of universal values and liberal integration of 'post-conventional' identities, it turned into a conflict of confronting particularism and negation and thus

elimination of Western universalism with neo-liberal imperial, and foremost, economic globalism.

Literature: Slavoj Žižek, *Metastaze uživanja* (Biblioteka XX vek, 1996); Mihailo Đurić, *O potrebi filozofije danas : Filozofija između Istoka i Zapada* (Svetovi, 1999); Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003); Chantal Mouffe, *The Return of the Political* (Verso, 2005);

Arendt, Hannah (1906-1975) was a Jewish-German-American political theorist. She studied philosophy at the University of Marburg. She attended the lectures of Martin Heidegger. There are stories of their love affair. She defended her doctoral thesis under the mentorship of Karl Jaspers in 1929 which was about the concept of love in the opinion of St. Augustine. As a Jew, she was not permitted to habilitate nor gain the right to lecture at a university. She researched German romanticism. She researched the life and works of the Jewish activist Rahel Warnhagen (1771-1833) which were published in English in 1958 in London and in German in 1959 in Munich. She dealt with political journalism and started research on the political theory of the critic Mannheim's work *Ideologies in Utopia* throughout 1933. She worked with different illegal organisations which organised emigrations from Germany. When the Gestapo started to take an interest in her work, she leaves Germany and goes to Paris. There she became friends with Walter Benjamin who was her first husband's, Gunter Stern's, cousin. She meets Heinz Blucher with whom she lives until her death in 1975. In France, she was sent to a concentration camp called *Gurs* for a few weeks. After the German occupation of France she leaves semi-legally to the United States in 1941. In New York she learned English and cooperated with emigrant organisations and newspapers. She lectured at the University of Chicago, at the New School for Social Research in New York, etc. She worked with the Commission of European Jewish Cultural Reconstruction and therefore often stayed in post-war Germany. She believed in the de-nazification of Germany.

Hannah Arendt left behind a comprehensive and compound work on political theory, ethics and anthropology. In her political theory she anticipated many important questions on interpreting 'human life' as a *social life* and as a *political life*. In her perhaps most important work, *Vita Activa* (the original title was called *The Human Condition*, 1958) she asks relevant questions about the 'human state', the 'human condition', i.e. 'human conditionalism' differentiating between relevant models of human growth: work, development and activity. For her, the expression *vita activa* means a life devoted to public, in a traditional sense, i.e. political things. Her political theory deals with interpreting the nature of 'power' as 'political', 'authoritarian' and 'totalitarian'. In relation to these categories she poses a theory of freedom and human emancipation. She also dealt with problems related to judgment, evil, radical evil, revolution, violence, differentiating between social and political, etc. By clearly differentiating between political knowledge and political ignorance she posed the basis of epistemological politics. A significant contribution of her theory, and undoubtedly philosophy, was her approach to translation and interpretation of 'human subjectivity potential' in modern times. Her uncompleted work *The Life of the Mind* (1978) was meant to be a companion piece to the book *The Human Condition* and covered the human domain which is named *thought, willpower* and *judgment*. The theoretical work of Hannah Arendt significantly influenced the constitution of bio-political thought and critique of global capitalism at the transition from the 20th to the 21st centuries.

Literature: Hannah Arendt: *Vita Activa* (AC, 1991); *O Revoluciji* (IP Filip Višnjić, 1991); *Izvori totalitarizma* (Feministička izdavačka kuća, 1998); *Eichmann u Jerusalimu – Izveštaj o banalnosti zla* (B92, 1999); *O nasilju* (Alexandria Press, 2002); *O zlu – Predavanje o nekim pitanjima moralne filozofije* (Naklada Breza, 2006); Daša Duhaček, Obrad Savić (eds), *Zatočenici zla: Zaveštanje Hane Arent* (Beogradski Krug i

Benjamin, Walter (1892-1940) was a German critical essayist, writer of prose, translator and philosopher. He was close to the Critical School in Frankfurt, especially to Theodore W. Adorno in the 1930's. His teachings can be considered to be radical, critical, modernistic thought about contemporary European culture in the 1920's and 1930's. He dealt with theory of art and is one of the founders of media studies (photography, film, mechanical reproduction). He set up theses on the role of aestheticism in totalitarian regimes. He researched Jewish mysticism under the influence of the Jewish scholar Gerschom Scholem (1897-1982). Benjamin's essayist opus is really the only relevant Marxist approach to art and contemporary culture before the Second World War which facilitates modernistic thought and which is realized as a critical project of the modern age. In the texts *A Small History of Photography* (1931) and *Artwork in the Interspace of Technical Reproduction* (1936), he pointed out specific modernistic new media and their social dimension, and in the text *Author as Producer* (1934) he re-defined artist as creator to artist as producer. In the essays "With the Critic of Might" (1921), "Theological-Political Fragment" and "Historically Philosophic Theses" (1939), he offered analyses on modern/contemporary shapes of living in industrial capitalism.

Walter Benjamin made differentiations between 'aesthetisation' in fascism, i.e. Nazism and communism in the epilogue of his text "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction". Benjamin starts from the thesis that in the contemporary, modern world of the 1930's a political approach of the 'organised' proletariat comes into being. The bourgeois hierarchical class structure of society is transformed into a horizontally-oriented mass consumer society and culture with possibilities of mass liberal and trade capitalism, Nazism and fascism as totalitarian and war-oriented mass societies, and communism as a revolutionary mass society. Benjamin's contemplation of *generating aestheticisation* was put in the following way: "The all greater proletarianisation of today's world and the all greater massiveness are two sides of the same event. Fascism continues to organise newly-created proletariat masses not becoming involved in personal relationships, ruling out those which they tend towards. He finds his salvation in allowing the masses to express themselves (not to their rights by any means). The masses have a right to change their personal relationships: fascism allows them to express the safe-keeping of those relationships. Fascism consequently leans towards aestheticisation of political life. Violent mechanisms suit the subjugated masses, which throw their leaders down to their knees by cults, because they allow them to create cultural values. Every attempt at political aestheticisation ends up at the same point. That point is war. War, and only war, can set a goal to mass movements of the greatest dimensions while preserving traditional personal relationships. This is how politics shapes situations. Technique formulates it like this: only war allows the mobilisation of all contemporary technical devices while preserving possessive relations. It is acceptable that the apotheosis of fascism in war does not employ these arguments." It is pointed out that fascism expects an *artistic fulfilment of sensual appreciation* from war, which is fundamentally changed and medially totalised by new technologies, for example, by media performances of *reality* aestheticisation using film, radio, photography and printed materials. Benjamin showed that in fascism/Nazism *self-alienation* within the masses and mass, reaches that level when self-destruction becomes an aesthetic experience of the first order. In his epilogue, he described the *logic* of carrying out militant aestheticisations in fascism and pointed out the character of aestheticisation

in communism in the last sentence: “This is the aesthetisation of politics which fascism carries out. And communism suits it because of the politicisation of art.” In social realism in the communist USSR, aesthetisation meant *embellishing reality*. It was not a portrayal of the world as it really was, but rather the artistic “showing” of prose, painting, film or theatre established towards political protocol programmes of optimal or potential reality of an idealised society.

Literature: Walter Benjamin, *Uz kritiku sile – eseji* (Razlog – SCSuZ, 1971); Walter Benjamin, *Estetički pogledi* (Školaska knjiga, 1986); Walter Benjamin, „Umetničko delo u veku svoje tehničke reprodukcije“ iz *Eseji* (Nolit, 1974, str. 119-122); Danko Grlić, “Misaona avantura Waltera Benjamina”, iz *Izazov negativnog*, Naprijed i Nolit, Zagreb, Beograd, 1988, str. 199-284; Žarko Paić, „Povratak aure“, iz *Slike bez svijeta – Ikonoklazam suvremene umjetnosti*, Litteris, Zagreb, 2006, str. 101-126.

Biopolitics was an important aspect of constituting and developing capitalism, according to Michel Foucault. It was established on the controlled initiation of the body into a producing machine and adjusting to the “phenomenon of people in economic processes”. Biopolitics was a necessary means of increasing strength, capability, life in a general sense and thereby not making subjugation of the people any more difficult. The term biopolitics is used to call an attempt, established in the 18th century, to rationalise the problems relevant for administering aspects which are characteristic for individual groups of living human beings which are constituted in the population, and these aspects are: health, executing health measures, birth-rate, life expectancy, life trend, etc. Biopolitics therefore appears in the 18th century as a technique of carrying out power which is found in all levels of society. It is used by various institutions such as marriage, family, school, university, the military, the police, hospitals but also by institutional articulations of hygiene, working and free time, public and private life, micro and macro societies, hierarchically-constituted societies, etc. According to Foucault: “Modulating the grouping of people with grouping capital and the articulation of human group growth to the expansion of production strengths and differential division of profits are partially made possible by carrying out bio-power, in its multiple shapes and uses. Occupying a live body, its value and the distributive managing of its powers were necessary in that moment.” More than terror and forcefulness of law, taking control of life is what gives power access to the body. If pressures which lead to the mutual permeation of life movement and historical processes can be called bio-initiators, then the phrase bio-politics would mean all which life and its mechanisms bring into the domain of explicit accounts, and power-knowledge would be taken as the factor of change in human lives.

Biopolitics is a group of techniques with which social power is realized through the articulation of organisations’ social, public and private lives. With the development of capitalism, biopolitics outgrows taking over responsibility for shaping individual bodies and is faced with deciding about life and death of large groups of people, that is, only the human species. And that is why Foucault emphasises: “Life has now become... the object of power”. According to Hardt and Negri, the highest function of that power is total occupation with life, and its primary task is controlling life. That is how bio-power relates to the state in which development and re-establishment of sole and overall life is the most important aspect in that power.

Contemporary bio-political theory is dealt with by Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, Giorgio Agamben, Paolo Virno, etc. Bio-political theory calls on new readings from the critics of capitalism of Karl Marx, schizo-analysis by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari and is thus constituted on an eminent arbitrary critique and pluralities of post-structural theory, post-historicism, and anti-essentialism of post-modern theory, rather, a functional neo-liberal polarisation of cultural studies from critical

theory towards theories of projecting a new world – global – order. Negri and Hardt's theory of bio-politics was developed as a critique to post-block globalism in the book *Empire* (2000). Paolo Virno developed bio-politics in the direction of philosophy of labour in post-Ford society, based on the teachings of Walter Benjamin and Hannah Arendt.

Simplified and anecdotally, one can say that a man from the Middle Ages was in a harmonious relationship with the performing organisation in the shape of life in every-day life which did not have a clear and important division between work and free time living. For a man or woman from the Middle Ages, the *shape of life*, was in some kind of relationship where he/she was serving God and His intermediaries in the social world. Contrary to this, with the creation of the bourgeois capitalistic society in the age of Enlightenment, there is a thorough divide between the *times of living* and the *shapes of life* in work and free, i.e. public and private time living. Unlike the *inseparable flux of living* of the man from the Middle Ages, during the period of Enlightenment there is a comprehensive divide between working and non-working, rather, public and private living, also with important divisions and differentiations between autonomous disciplines of public labour. In this kind of context, one special and significant problem was the occupation of free every-day life and its organisation, above all, for the existing bourgeois class. Free time was seen as free time from work, but also as time which should be organised with all its political and social autonomies, and that means 'disciplined' and controlled 'freedoms'. In the framework of society based on useful and business production, exchange and spending, it is as though an unutilised work *reserve* of fulfilment and behaviour was promised, for which aesthetics created a platform, and which was realized with the new concept of art. Because art, from ancient times, through the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the Baroque period, straight through to Classicism and then Romanticism, was a part of *useful work* institutionalised through crafts. Only in bourgeois society does it come to a turnover from *useful work* in freedom to autonomous work which was seen, above all in Romanticism, as a 'creation' against 'production'. Through aesthetics, protocol of pragmatic disinterest was offered for *regimes of sensual reception* which became the basis for free creation outside the demands of useful work.

Bio-political philosophy once again posed the question about the character of *human work* with its radical materialism in contemporary globalised society, and thus the contradictory relations of bio-power and bio-technology in shaping exceptional human life between individualism, collectivity and 'mankind'. In bio-politics, a new interpretation of 'plural' was put out against the bourgeois concept of people as well as the traditional Marxist thought and interpretation of the 'working class' as the avant-garde of the communist revolution. Likewise, bio-politics showed the fundamental character of capitalism and its expansive politics which puts human life in horizons of permanent states of emergency in the fight for profit.

Literature: Mišel Fuko, *Istorija seksualnosti – Volja za znanjem* (Prosveta, 1982); Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt (eds), *Radical Thought in Italy – A Potential Politics* (University of Minnesota Press, 1996); Michel Foucault, „The Birth of Biopolitics” iz Paul Rabinow (ed), *Michel Foucault: Ethics – Subjectivity and Truth* (London: Penguin Books, 1997, str. 73-79); Giorgio Agamben, *The Man without Content* (Stanford University Press, 1999); Giorgio Agamben, *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy* (Stanford University Press, 2000); Mišel Fuko, *Nenormalni – Predavanja na Kolež de Fransu 1974-1975* (Svetovi, 2002); Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive* (Zone Books, 2002); Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003); Jean-Luc Nancy, „Bilješka o terminu *biopolitika*”, iz *Stvaranje svijeta ili mondijalizacija* (Jasenski i Turk, 2004, str. 133-139); Giorgio Agamben, *The Open: Man and Animal* (Stanford University Press, 2004); Paolo Virno, *Gramatika mnoštvo – Prilog analizi suvremenih formi života* (Jasenski i Turk, 2004); Giorgio Agamben, *Homo sacer – Suverena moć i goli život* (Multimedijalni institut, 2006);

Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) is a French philosopher who developed the critique of structuralism and constituted potential possibilities for new political, phenomenal and existential philosophical theories. He lectured at various lycées until he became professor at Sorbonne University in 1957. He started to lecture at the experimental University of Paris VIII in Saint Vincent in 1969 where he stayed until he retired in 1987. He wrote about philosophy, prose, film and painting. He worked on philosophical monographs about Baruch De Spinoza, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, David Hume, Immanuel Kant, Friedrich Nietzsche, Henri Bergson and Michel Foucault. He wrote about novel writers Proust and Kafka and about the artist Francis Bacon. His most relevant works (*Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Anti-Oedipus*, 1972; *A Thousand Plateaus*, 1980; *What is Philosophy?* 1991) were written together with psycho-therapist, theoretician, and activist Felix Guattari. His thorough philosophical works are *Difference and Repetition* (1968) and *The Logic of Sense* (1969).

For Deleuze and Guattari, philosophy as an activity or as an 'act', rather, an *event* allows a confrontation of activated local and universal knowledge to take place inside an individual 'body'. In contemporary philosophy a relevant question is posed: in what way can universal concepts, rather, concepts of the universal, inside an 'individual' or 'local' practice be produced? Individual is the condition for universal, and thus multiplicity. Because, 'multiplicity' is not found; it must be created in external relations which exist between concepts and their presentations as concepts. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari promisingly set up the conflict between 'individual' and 'general', rather, *local* and *universal*: "Philosophical concepts are fragmented wholes which do not fit into each other because their edges do not touch. It is easier to say that they exist accidentally instead of saying that they make up the puzzle. But still, they ring together, and the philosophy which creates them is always one powerful, undivided, notwithstanding wholeness: an unlimited One-for-All, *Omnitudo*, which encompasses all concepts in one, same plan. It is a template, trestle, intersection, one plan of consistency or, more accurately, a plan of imminent concepts, a **planomen**. The concepts and plan are closely connected, but that is why we cannot mix them up. The plan of immanency is not a concept, nor the concept of all concepts. If we forgot that, nothing would stop concepts from becoming one, or from becoming generalisms and losing their individualities, whereby the plan would concurrently lose its openness". It is therefore important to stress, that philosophy is not 'revelation' in a religious sense or a 'finding' in the scientific sense. Rather, it is a constructivist and developed practice: the real constructivism. And every constructivism has two aspects which complement each other and determine it: (i) creating, i.e. construing concepts, and (ii) describing the plan, i.e. prefiguring the protocol contours for philosophical procedures of construing concepts. You and such *concepts* are: "Something resembling a multiplicity of waves which rise and fall, and the plan of immanency is a unique wave which builds and unbuilds them. The plan encompasses endless movements which serve it and then turn back into themselves, and the concepts are endless speeds of final movements which always only serve their own interests." In this context, the *immanency plan* is not thought or a thinking concept, but rather a unified picture of thoughts, a picture by which the meaning of thought, usage of thought, and orientation in thought is shown. Immanency is not a 'method' for Deleuze and Guattari, but rather a 'fundamental', moving construct which gathers philosophical momentum, depicting a thought and more important possibilities for thought. The immanency plan is, therefore, like that which precedes philosophy, (only movement which is the picture of thought) and at the same time, that which can be seen and experienced as an event, just from philosophy.

One of Deleuze's key concepts is 'event'. His philosophy of events relates to different auto-critics of semiology, linguistic centrism and predominance of interpretation designated in the late post-Lacanian post-structuralism. His philosophy is on post-Heidegger's interest of event (*Ereignis*). Deleuze's and Guattari's concept of 'event' is determined by permanent, but discontinued continuation: endless variation, continued metamorphosis, mutation, flux, movement, movable machines, passing by, film, continuation, territorialisation, de-territorialisation, correlation, **rizom**. In Jacques Derrida's philosophy, 'event' is difference: an event of temporary deferral and moving of present letter and writing. Lacan's interest for event is determined by the crossing over from the tactics of interpretation of designated topology to benchmarking an object (for example, "a small a") and its impossible or missing functioning place, rather, researching subtle and unified relations of the subject and other, that is to say, the debate of the role of the Real as that which loses its symbolisation but permeates it as a traumatic pre-determination. For Slavoj Žižek, event is that which is external to text, that which signifies an intervention of material formation like an event (*a stitched point*, Really, castration, object, unconsciously, space) into a system of textual, that is symbolic intervention. Alain Badiou appears as a philosopher who repeats philosophy through thought about accessing the event which begins: "These events, in every generic procedure, condition philosophy today. It is our duty to produce a conceptual figuration suitable for its acceptance, however weakly named it may be right now, if not determined too... It is good, namely, to produce concepts and rules of thought, maybe even before every explicit commemoration of these names and acts, maybe very close to them, it depends, but they have to be such that, through these concepts and rules our time can prefigure as a time in which *with thought that happened* which never happened, and moreover everyone can share it even if they do not know it, because one philosophy made a communal refuge of *it happened*, for everyone". In Foucault's later texts, event is a bio-political articulation (shaping, regulation, control) of the body-mind, i.e. individuals in specific societal, cultural, historical and geographical space of capitalism. Groups of living beings constitute themselves as a population through articulation of health, hygiene, habituation, every-day life, work, division of social roles, and relation to political power. Giorgio Agamben points to an integrated thought of events as life forms, as a life which can never be separated from its form, i.e. a life in which it is impossible to isolate something like a common or bare life. Philosophers of bio-politics, from Foucault to Agamben to Negri and Hardt show a critical appearance of events or chain of life-developing events.

From the Deleuze viewpoint for example, the *appearance of the body* in the world is determined by the crossing from semiotic realisation as designated anticipations of semantic figures in the text about realising the effects of actions and intensity of individual machines in the process of articulating an individual or producing a life. That is, we are speaking about realising an event in which it is *not only a body* or event which is *performing not only a body*. The syntagm *not only a body* means that the body does not appear as *only a body* behind the coating of appearing senna (Plato), semblances of every-day life (Heidegger), discursive practices (Foucault), traces of culture (Derrida) or historical texts (Christeva). The *body* is something conceived, begun, that which seems and acts, producing or behaving between many potentials. Potentials are not only meanings, or only agreeable identities but sensual/physical appearances which are out of control in an open and undetermined world. The body is not a mark, and that means preparation for one letter, one sign, one code, one work or one text – the body is not a mark for

stipulative knowledge which will be useful in reading the identity of the body. The body is a producing *machine* by which *fluxes of content* and *expression* of appearance and intervention of the body here-and-there then, here-and-now or there-in-between do not depend on the mark. For us, bodies are most commonly, *bodies in-between*. They are caught in the happening of the experience, communication and physical/sensual confrontations of *fluxes* interrupted by potentials which exist and lead different incomparable registers of recognition and identification of the body. Every individual body is in the multiplicity of cutting off different *fluxes*: trends of appearing and developing. There is not a body of one or that one centred identity. An individual body is simultaneously in different identities which express and which constitute through expression: race, ethnicity, sex, class, generation, profession, etc.

Literature: Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, *On Line* (Semiotext(e), 1983); Gilles Deleuze, *Francis Bacon: Logique de la sensation* (La Différence, 1984); Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema II: The Time-Image* (University of Minnesota Press, 1989); Žil Delez, *Fuko* (IK Zorana Stojanovića, 1989); Žil Deleze, Feliks Gatari, *Anti-Edip, Kapitalizam i šizofrenija* (IK Zorana Stojanovića, 1990); Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition* (Columbia University Press, 1994); Gilles Deleuze, *Negotiations 1972-1990* (Columbia University Press, 1995); Žil Deleze, Feliks Gatari, *Šta je filozofija?* (IK Zorana Stojanovića, 1995); *L'abécédaire de Gilles Deleuze avec Claire Parnet* (DVD, Editions Montparnasse, 1997); Žil Delez, *Pokretne slike* (IK Zorana Stojanovića, 1998); Žil Delez, *Prust i znaci* (Plato, 1998); Žil Delez, *Niče i filozofija* (Plato, 1999); Žil Delez, *Bergsonizam* (Narodna knjiga, 2001); Gilles Deleuze; Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus - Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Continuum, 2002).

The form of life is one of the basic concepts of bio-political theory. The usage of the concept 'life' and 'life form' are owed to analyses and discussions of difference and contradictions between undepicted-inarticulate life nature and depicted-articulate life society/culture, and that which can be called 'art'. Analyses and discussions about 'life' and 'life forms' are carried out in social philosophy on the trace of Aristotle's, Spinoza's, Walter Benjamin's, Hannah Arendt's, Michel Foucault's, partly Jacques Lacan's, and wholly Gilles Deleuze's thought, and Felix Guattari can be added as well. Bio-political thinking starts as a direct critique to post-structuralist 'textocentrism' by pointing out the existence and appearance which are outside the field of symbolisation as a referee, disruption, as that which falls out, or as existence.

According to Giorgio Agamben, old Greeks did not have a unique term which would express what we understand by the word *life*. They used two terms, which were semantically and morphologically different: *zoe*, which marked the sole fact of communal life of all living beings (animals, people, or gods) and *bios*, which marked form or the personal way of life of an individual or group. In modern languages, from which this difference has slowly gone out of vocabulary, there where it is still preserved, in expressions such as *biology* and *zoology*, it no longer constitutes any significant difference. The one and only expression – 'life' – is used in that its unclarity grows proportionally and sacreligiously to its referee. 'Alive' marks a common unified assumption which is almost always possible to isolate in any numerous form of life.

By the term *life form* it is understood, however, that life is something which can never be separated from its form, a life in which it is impossible to isolate something like a *common* or *bare* life. In this place, there is a fundamental difference between the theoretisation of 'life' constituted in cultural studies and philosophical interpretations of 'life' provoked in bio-political philosophy. In cultural studies, the post-post-structural thesis is postulated so that there is no *bare life* but rather that this is about textual representations and presentations inside closed cultural systems. Life is shown as a text or an 'unbare life'. In the philosophy of bio-politics a thesis is set out about analytical critical separation of 'natural' from 'humane', political, intellectual life. Life is shown as an event with consequences. Whereby it is shown that a 'common' or 'bare' life is also a so-called derivative of the relationships *zoe*

and *bio*, actually a produced event of one operation of power: “Man is at that, the driving force and product of that process” and Agamben adds that he is currently preoccupied with the contradiction that man must become a machine in order to produce a man.

Literature: Giorgio Agamben, „Form-of-Life“, iz Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt (eds), *Radical Thought in Italy – A Potential Politics* (University of Minnesota Press, 1996, str. 151-156); Giorgio Agamben: *Infancy and History – the Destruction of Experience* (Verso, 2007); *Language and Death: The Place of Negativity* (University of Minnesota Press, 1991); *Stanzas: Word and Phantasm in Western Culture* (University of Minnesota Press, 1993); *Homo sacer – Suverena moć i goli život* (Multimedijski institut, 2006); *The Man without Content* (Stanford University Press, 1999); *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy* (Stanford University Press, 2000); *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive* (Zone Books 2002); *The Open: Man and Animal* (Stanford University Press, 200); *State of Exception* (The University of Chicago Press, 2005).

Foucault, Michel (1926-1984) was a French philosopher who in the context of French Nietzscheanism and immanent critique of structuralism brought in concepts of discursive analysis, archeology of knowledge, genealogy, analysis of power, analysis of subject, analysis of sexual identity, analysis of homosexual identity, analysis of sexual history, analysis of bio-politics, i.e. societies of punishment, supervision and control. He taught “The History of Thinking Systems” at the Collège de France. Michel Foucault established the concept of bio-politics which in certain aspects prepared and anticipated bio-political philosophy in the 1990’s and the first decade of the 21st century.

Michel Foucault established the concept of archeologies of knowledge so that he could metaphorically name the method of the philosophical and theoretical research structuring of knowledge in specifically located and limited historical interspaces. With this, a turnover from the general homogenising history of ideas in the history of a discontinued layered structured thought and comprehension was created. Foucault’s archeology of knowledge was led by an analytical ambition of reconstruing the conditions of possibilities for human performances, comprehensions and language signals in singular historical interspaces (layers of the epi-system). Archeology, therefore, does not grow from determining thought, performances, paintings, themes and obsessions which hide themselves or show themselves in discourses but rather discourses alone, i.e. discourses as practices subjected to regulations. Archeology does not lean towards observing and interpreting unbroken passages which connect discourses; on the contrary, its problem is determining discourses in their specificity, showing why the *game* which employs rules is irreducible to any other kind, following the length of its external borders and better marking of boundaries. Archeology does not conform to the sovereign image of the body, it does not look for a puzzling point in which individual and social go from one to another. Archeology defines types and rules of discursive practices attributable to singular works. Therefore, archeology is not a return to the sole secret of the origin of a subject, but a systematic description of a subject discourse. For Foucault, the areas of research are homogenous internally, and heterogeneous between themselves. In other words, archeology does not establish continuity between different areas (the Renaissance, Classic or Modern era) but observes them as closed discursive worlds. In this framework of research, Foucault’s works, *Historie da la Foile – A l’Age Classique* (1961) and *Les Mots et Les Choses – Une Archéologie des Sciences Humaines* (1966) were established.

An auto-critique of the archeology of knowledge method was carried out by Michel Foucault around 1975, taking over the genealogy idea from Nietzsche’s philosophy, *Zur Genealogie der Moral* (1887). At the time when he started to research the mechanisms of power, Foucault developed techniques of rearrangements

and unbuilding of the senses, feelings and concepts into invisible structures of discontinued series, traces and relations. Power was not a neutral research area for him, but rather an interventive and interactive area which affects the position of the researcher-archeologist. The aim of genealogy is reconstruction of actual archeological positions and their procedures, namings, classifications and interpretations. Foucault's analysis is aimed towards the critique and unbuilding of the constituted population in Western humanism from the Enlightenment to the present day. An example is Foucault's discussion adapted to the concept of truth. He prefigures truth as a gathering of regulated procedures for production, law, division, putting into circulation, and functioning of implications. The truth is circularly connected to systems of power which produce and support it and for efficiencies of power which it induces and which reproduce it. The regime of truth is not simply ideological or pre-structural, it is the condition for creation and development of social formations (capitalism, real socialism). Therefore, a thorough political question is not one about illusions or ideologies as altered realities, but about the only truth and its structures in the social area of power.

In one of his conversations, Michel Foucault called his philosophical research of social and cultural institutions of French society in the 17th and 18th centuries, *ethnological*; rather, he determined *ethnology* in the following way: "It is possible to define it as an analysis of civilizational facts characteristic for our culture. In this sense, we mean the special ethnology of culture that we belong to. Really, I am trying to leave the culture that we belong to, so that I can analyse its formal conditions and by this, so to speak, to formulate its critiques! Thereby, it is not my intention, however, to disown its works, but to discover how they really came into being, because I am analysing the conditions of our rationality, I am bringing into question even our language, my own language, the language which I am analysing." In this way, the prefigured hypothetical philosophical *ethnology* allows for cultural research or chosen institutions, that is, representative contexts of civilization. This is why we approach metaphysics, history and the actual occurrence of philosophy and aesthetics as an external ethnological researcher (a foreigner) whose formation of the *normality* of one world (*philosophy* and *aesthetics* are definitely in question, which is the reason for their *jargons*) is turned into an archive of knowledge.

Literature: Mišel Fuko, *Riječi i stvari – Arheologija humanističkih nauka* (Nolit, 1971); Mišel Fuko, *Istorija ludila u doba klasicizma* (Nolit, 1980); Mišel Fuko, *Istorija seksualnosti – Volja za znanjem* (Prosveta, 1982); Mišel Fuko, *Istorija seksualnosti – Korišćenje ljubavnih uživanja* (Prosveta, 1988); Mišel Fuko, *Istorija seksualnosti – Staranje o sebi* (Prosveta, 1988); Žil Delez, *Fuko* (IK Zorana Stojanovića, 1989); Mišel Fuko, *Predavanja* (IP "Bratstvo-jedinstvo", 1990); Michel Foucault, *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology* (Penguin Books, 1994); Michel Foucault, *Nadzor i kazna – rađanje zatvora* (FPZ, 1994); Michel Foucault, *Znanje i moć* (Globus, 1994); Michel Foucault, *Ethics – Subjectivity and Truth* (Penguin Books, 1997); Mišel Fuko, *Arheologija znanja* (Plato, 1998); Mišel Fuko, *Treba braniti društvo – Predavanja na Kolež de Fransu iz 1976. godine* (Svetovi, 1998); Mišel Fuko, *Nenormalni – Predavanja na Kolež de Fransu 1974-1975* (Svetovi, 2001); Mišel Fuko, *Hermeneutika subjekta – Predavanja na Kolež de Fransu 1981-1982* (Svetovi, 2003); David Macey, *Michel Foucault* (Reaktion Books, 2004).

Globally, globalism and globalisation are three different concepts which talk about the situation of shaping human individual or collective life today.

The word global is used to name every access or position, that is, viewpoint on human 'planetary' relations on a social, political, economic, cultural, or art plan. The open concept of 'global' is opposed to closed in some potential way – claustrophobic – concepts of local, regional, national, ethnic, religious, particular, state, continental, etc.

Completely different plural and multiple tendencies of 'planetary' connections and movements of human life are called globalism.

The concept of 'globalisation' relates to, above all, economic and political, i.e. trade, and thus war and terrorist globalisms, which like neo-liberal projects, constitute themselves in belated capitalism and expansively realizes themselves following the end of the block division of the world at the end of the 1980's. Between the concepts of 'globalism' and 'globalisation' there are no overlaps; instead there are insecure and often contradictory, and thus conflictual relations. The concept of globalism includes the concept of globalisation and the concepts of anti-globalisation. Care has to be taken with this conceptual contradiction and tension in analyses of the contemporary.

The concept of 'globalisation' was used in economic discourses from the end of the Second World War. The modern distinction of the concept of globalisation was introduced by American economist Theodore Levitt (1925-2006) who lectured at Harvard Business School. He introduced the concept of globalisation, ("Globalisation of Markets", 1983) so that he could elaborate the concept of "corporate purposes", i.e. corporate purpose is creating and keeping the consumer-customer on the market whereby the market is not only economical but also a globally, social category. Globalisation can therefore be defined as a neo-liberal, capitalistic integration of economic, cultural, political, and social systems constituting super-imposed and comprehensive connected relations of market internationalisation and local existences, i.e. global spending and local production. The process of capital integration after the completion of the block division of the world unfolds with a mass deterioration of symbolic (nations) and infrastructural (states) organisation of human life, and then, with market-economic (trans-national or multi-national companies, mega markets) mergers and connections of de-territorialised and decoded convections in production, exchange and spending goods in the modern world. Economically-productive globalisation is depicted as an expansion of 'local' practices of production, exchange and spending on a supra-national and trans-state, that is, on a planetary level. Economic-productive and market globalisation is structurally depicted as the globalisation of:

- products and services
- work and people
- capital and
- technology

On the basis of the described model, a greater concept of globalisation is constituted, which marks the de-territorialisation of the local and re-territorialisation of the global on the external-economic-producing domains of society, culture, art, technology, ecology, entertainment and all kinds of every-day life shapings as such, as well as terrorism, that is, war. In the practices of globalisation, the concept of 'standardisation' in the development of life is also brought in – that is why globalisation is re-defined as a social practice in which every-day life in its local specificity and closure is standardised on a global level.

The concept 'globalisation' should be differentiated from the concept of colonisation, imperialism and multi-national corporatism, and should be linked to the concept of 'empire' by Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt.

Colonisation is the name given to the project of political conquest and annexation, above all, outside European territory due to economic and industrial exploitation. Colonialism is a political concept of expanding national sovereignty across state borders. The concepts of colonialism and imperialism are often portrayed as connected concepts.

Imperialism is the political, economic, productive, social, cultural, and art - direct or indirect - domination of a national state and its society, culture and art over other national states or cultures, that is, civilizations. French, English, Belgian, or Dutch, that is, German and Italian imperialism was shown as an imperial colonialism, an economic hegemonisation, but also as a cultural and artistic imperialism from the 17th to the 20th centuries. For example, the influence of French culture and society throughout the 19th and first half of the 20th century, was imperialistic because it brought the ideas of French national culture and art to international cultural canons or art hegemonies. Imperialism is always international – it goes from one national state towards other states, cultures and civilizations.

Multi-national corporatism marks the concept of multi-national companies in the era of colonialism; for example, the Dutch East India Company (*Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie* or VOC, established in 1602 and disbanded in 1800) is considered to be the first multi-national company. A national state which enforces colonization, firstly assumes resources, work and the market on colonized territory.

According to Negri and Hardt, the concept of ‘empire’, taken from the political history of ancient Rome, is applied to the politics of globalism after the end of the Cold War and reinstates the state politics of the United States as the only dominant world superpower in a political, military and economic sense. While *modern imperialism* marks the international hegemony of one society over other societies, a *globalised empire* marks the structural organisation of a world order as a unique, multi-social and multi-cultural market. According to Negri and Hardt, the primary aim of the politics of work which carry out the empire, is to decrease the price of work by including local production practices in a controlled, globalised market. Financial and monetary trends follow more or less the same global forms as an elastic work force organisation. This means that the overall articulation of the shape of life plays around the ‘price of the work force’ and its incorporation into a global product on the global market.

The process of starting up institutions of globalism and globalisation started after the Second World War with political organisations such as the United Nations (UN, 1945), the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO, 1949), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT, 1947) and the World Trade Organisation (WTO, 1995), etc. All of these institutions, on the one hand, constitute possibilities for globalisation, and on the other hand, allow the realisation of a *global civil society*.

In a culture, globally is identified most commonly as Americanisation or bringing in the American way of life in a culture outside of the United States; then, as globally opening up local cultures in an era without distinct cultural or art centres, and thus as prevalent, deconstructive, or destructive to local national or ethnic, that is, racial and religious cultures. The concept of globalisation in culture is compared with the concept of Americanisation of world culture. The global opening up of local cultures can be seen in its own critical relationship towards economic-market globalism because it sets demands for rights of mobility of life and not only on capital at a global, i.e. planetary level. In this context, the term ‘globally’ can also be set out as a term of ‘global democratisation’ or ‘open globalisation’ or ‘radical globalisation’ and ‘life globalism’.

Literature: „Posebno izdanje: Svet posle 11. septembra“ (*Nova srpska politička misao* br. 4, 2002); Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003); [Manfred Steger](#), *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction* ([Oxford University Press](#), 2003); Olja Nušić, Dušan Veličković (eds), *Glokalni svet – Osam ogleda o globalizaciji* (Alexandria Press, 2003); Saskia Sassen, *Protugeografije globalizacije* (Multimedijalni institut, 2003); Gilane Tawadros (ed), *Changing States – Contemporary Art and Ideas in an Era of Globalisation* (Institute of International Visual Arts, 2004); Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (Penguin Press, 2004); [Martin Wolf](#), *Why Globalization Works* (Yale University Press, 2004); [Alex](#)

[MacGillivray, *A Brief History of Globalization: the Untold Story of our Incredible Shrinking Planet* \(Carroll & Graf, 2006\); Warwick E. Murray, *Geographies of Globalization* \(Routledge/Taylor and Francis, 2006\).](#)

Felix Guattari (1930-1992) was a French psycho-therapist, activist, and social theoretician. He developed his early practical and theoretical work in shapes of Lacan's theoretical psycho-analysis. With Gilles Deleuze he established a critique of Lacanism. He put forward key theories and practical relations between philosophy, theory, and activism. He brought in philosophically-theoretical, and activistically-political concepts of 'schizo-analysis' and 'ecosophy'. According to him schizo-analysis is an anti-Lacan theory of incidents which are created by mixing up subjects or the work of subjects as machines in relation to the horizons of structuring subjects and their meanings in a capitalistic society. For psycho-analysis, the event of incident mixing and its intensity inside stable and hierarchical constellations of capitalism is relevant. Ecosophy or ecophilosophy is philosophical or theoretical practice which critically theorises the problem of eco-centrism and bio-centrism. Ecosophy is a field of activist practice which brings in ecological and atmospheric epistemologies into the study of social subjects. According to Guattari, without modifying social and material surroundings we cannot access changes in human mentality – this means that in his discussions of society, a connection is made between atmospheric ecology, social ecology and mental ecology in global capitalism. He worked with Gilles Deleuze on the books *Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Anti-Oedipus* (1972); *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980); *What is Philosophy?* (1991). To a great extent, his work pre-dates anti-globalism theory and practice, standing for micro-physics of power, knowledge and activities.

Literature: Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, *On Line* (Semiotext(e), 1983); Félix Guattari, *Molecular Revolution: Psychiatry and Politics* (Semiotext(e), 1984); Žil Deleze, Feliks Gatari, *Anti-Edip, Kapitalizam i šizofrenija* (IK Zorana Stojanovića, 1990); Felix Guattari, *Chaosmosis: an Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm* (Indiana University Press, 1995); Felix Guattari, *Chaosophy* (Semiotext(e), 1995); Felix Guattari, *Soft Subversions* (Semiotext(e), 1996); Gary Genosko (ed), *The Guattari Reader* (Blackwell, 1996); Felix Guattari, *The Three Ecologies* (The Athlone Press, 2000); Gilles Deleuze; Felix Guattar, *A Thousand Plateaus - Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Continuum, 2002); Felix Guattari, *Chaos and Complexity* (MIT Press, 2008).

Stuart Hall (Kingston, Jamaica, 1932) is a cultural theoretician and sociologist who works in Great Britain. He is one of the leading figures on cultural and media studies. He lectured at the University of Birmingham where he became a leading figure at the *Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies*, as well as at the *Open University* from 1979-1997. He worked on editing left-wing magazines such as *Universities and Left Review* and worked with E.P. Thompson and Raymond Williams on *New Left Review*. He started his specific, critical career as a co-author with Paddy Whannel on the book *Popular Art* (1964). Because of this book, Richard Hogart invited him to work with him at the *Centre for Contemporary Studies* in Birmingham. He became director of the centre in 1968. His theoretical work belongs to British materialistic studies in which post-structuralist and post-Gramscian common, popular, and media culture theoretisations were established. He canonically tightened, re-directed and established concepts about four great destabilising powers and knowledge in the western world:

1. Marx, according to him, destabilised the bourgeois 'general public opinion' and 'self-coherence' of social and cultural identities, pointing to the role of agency and practice in society;
2. Sigmund Freud decentred relationships of identity and self-consciousness of a subject by bringing in the concept of the unconscious;

3. Ferdinand de Saussure problematised the concepts of meaning, pointing to a primate, functions and effects of structured, i.e. inter-linguistic relationships, and thus brought in thorough assumptions for every anti-essential, linguistic/semiology and that is the presumption about the relationship of the signifier and the signified in a sign;

4. Friedrich Nietzsche, Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida assumed meta-physical, epistemological and deconstructivist conditions for problematising the 'truth' and by this allowed the execution of a new critical theory for relativity of the western world.

5.

These four assumptions allowed Hall to perform his thesis that the western 'epi-system' is just one of the possible *regime truths* – which led to a political, economic and cultural critic of western hegemonies about truth, communication, production, exchange and reception of meaning. Hall's theory is often, because of its aspects, prefigured as a post-Cartesian and a radically relativistic theory of critique of western essentialism and organic thought. It is established as a materialistic theorisation, which means that it did not lean towards building a theoretical system of thought and cultural analysis, but rather a hybrid practice of theorisation. Hall wrote that the future belongs to the 'impure', which means hybrid, heterogenous and multiple, so the politics of the future are a 'politics of hybridism'. In a practical sense, Hall dealt with problems of hegemony, power, identity, institution, relations between the producer and consumer, media discourses, etc. In a methodological sense, he constituted solid models of 'textual analysis' of culture and the media, that is, consumer media culture in multi-cultural conditions. In the theory of identity, he developed an explicit model of *social constructivism*. He worked on analyses of 'links' between racial prejudices and media production. He was very influential for politically-ideological work of the new labourism in Britain, although he denied any kind of tie to the Labour Party. Some critics of cultural studies and Hall's work point out that his theoretical relativisms and anti-essentialist approach to identity have allowed the establishment of multi-cultural politics as one of the dominant politics of modern globalisation.

Literature: Stuart Hall, "Kulturalni studiji i njihovo teorijsko naslijeđe", "Kodiranje/dekodiranje", "Bilješke uz dekonstruiranje *popularnog*" i "Kome treba identitet" iz Dean Duda (ed), *Politika teorije – zbornik rasprava iz kulturalnih studija* (Disput D.o.o, 2005, str.109-123, 127-139; 297-309 i 357.374); Stuart Hall, *The Hard Road to Renewal - Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left* (Verso, 1988), *Resistance Through Rituals - Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain* (Routledge, 1989), *Formations of Modernity - Understanding Modern Societies* (Polity Press, 1992), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (Sage, 1996), *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (Sage, 1997); Chris Rojek, *Stuart Hall* (Polity, 2003); David Morley, Kuan-Hsing Chen (eds), *Stuart Hall – Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (Routledge, 2005).

Michael Hardt (1960) works on literary theory, Italianism and on the philosophy of politics. He lectures at Duke University in the United States. He studied mechanics and worked in the NGO sector in Central America. He then studied and received a PhD in comparative literature from the University of Washington between 1983-1990. He published many books independently or together with the Italian political theorist Antonio Negri. The books *Empire* (2000) and *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (2004) became international best-sellers of new critical theory on the transition from the 20th to the 21st centuries. The book *Empire* was called the 'new communist manifest for the 21st century' by some interpreters. Negri and Hardt established thorough philosophical assumptions of new Marxist activism and theoretical critiques of modern capitalism and globalism. They re-established the debate of the new world order by modelling the ideals of

'empire' and the 'imperial organisation of the world', and thus offered an emancipating project called the 'global democratic movement'. In a wider context, their work was set up as a bio-political philosophy based on the philosophy of rationality by Baruch de Spinoza (1632-1677), the dialectic materialism of Karl Marx, the political anthropology of Hannah Arendt, the critical theory of modern culture by Walter Benjamin, the anarchic thought of Pier Paolo Pasolini (1922-1975), the evolution of bio-politics by Michel Foucault, the philosophy of affects by Gilles Deleuze and the theory of alternative critical practices by Felix Guattari. Hardt's research is directed towards questions of politics, legality, economics and social aspects of globalisation.

His acquaintanceship with Antonio Negri steered him towards radical critical philosophy and a relevant interest for contemporary Italian Marxist theory of philosophers and theoreticians such as Paolo Virno, Massimo de Carolis, Adelo Zanini, Rossana Rossanda, Carlo Vercellone, Alisa Del Re, Marco Revelli, Franco Piperno, Maurizio Lazzarato, Giorgio Agamben, Augusto Illuminati, etc. Michael Hardt and Paolo Virno offered an important, global, and publically-aimed theoretical platform for executing new materialistic and activist Italian philosophy at the transition of the 20th and 21st centuries, in a collection of texts called *Radical Thought in Italy*.

Literature: Michael Hardt, *Gilles Deleuze: An Apprenticeship in Philosophy* (University of Minnesota Press, 1993); Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, *Labor of Dionysus: A Critique of the State-Form* (University of Minnesota Press, 1994); Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt (eds), *Radical Thought in Italy – A Potential Politics* (University of Minnesota Press, 1996); Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003); Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (Penguin Press, 2004).

Ideology as a concept can be introduced on more, sometimes similarly valuable and different ways of determining representative relations to the world and projections of the world, that is, the life in the world and the way in which life in the world is represented and shown. Ideology, at that, is not only a common performance-reflection, but is instead that which is constituted as a performance by the act which the subject of that performance has reconstructed. In the primary sense, ideology is a group of convictions, performances and values which allow experience and understanding of the world. In a liberal sense, ideology is a group of positive and pragmatic convictions, values, ways of behaviour and facts which are shared by one group of theoreticians or practitioners, that is, members of a culture or *some* differentiated formation in the boundaries of culture. In a traditional Marxist sense, ideology is a group of wrong performances, false convictions and illusions which are shared by members of the social layer, class, nation, political party, specific culture or art world projecting its possible world as the world of all life. In a general structural sense, ideology is a group of symbolic and imaginary, arbitrary and artificial effects which are produced by the media system in places of expected reality; ideology installs *subject* for object between objects of exchange, spending, seduction, ecstasy and entropy, that is, through media means, ideology becomes a multiplied new reality (*hyper-reality*). Psycho-analytically speaking, ideology is a phantasmatic construction which serves as a support to human *reality*, it is an *illusion* – systems of illusionist performances – which structures effective social relations and camouflages traumatic social *divides* which cannot be symbolised, that is why the function of ideology is to supply the subject with a tolerable, social reality – the subject does not have any other reality than the one offered. In a cultural sense, ideology is a cluster of meanings, performances and shapes of producing knowledge and performances which determine one culture necessarily or motivationally/historically change it from an

irregulated (or under-regulated) system to a *regulated* (or overly-regulated) system of production, exchange, spending and enjoying senses, goods, products, exchanges, spendings, enjoyments, and power. From the viewpoint of critical theory, ideology is a hidden (unspoken, invisible, deep) formation which determines a society or societal formation regardless of whether or not it *expresses* itself in compliance with it as an ideology. From the viewpoint of cultural studies, ideology is meaning, point and value of the power structure which a formation or society as a whole practices or leans towards; but ideology is also a system, a formation or group of signs, and even a mark, or more accurately, semantic practices which one society sets up for itself or for whom it is set up (from someone else) as a criteria for identification, etc.

To say *ideology* in a historical sense, means fixating different statuses of phantasms or convictions. A phantasm is brought to a rational or pragmatic *language* of indexation, identification and regulation. In the western tradition of the modern age, during the 18th and 19th centuries, ideology was understood *as* a natural world in which the subject is merged, and which sees ideological over-determination, determination, and under-determination only through transcending possibilities of differentiation between internal and external identities (being). In twentieth-century modernisms, ideology is an externally placed *big story* about the past (*dialectics of history*), the present (*the phenomenology of the human spirit*) and the future (all of those *utopian stories* about a possible, better world from theosophy, through socio-utopianism and Marxism to *new-age*, hippies and *giving* of the youth in 1968). In post-modern culture at the end of the Cold War, ideology is a fragmentary local or individual or *delayed* story which is a trace of utopianism (phantasm) or an erased trace of identity (a hole in the primary language of prefiguring a meta-language of the master); rather, in post-modern culture, there is a synchronization of large ideologies and small, every-day ideologies, present ideologies of actuality and delayed or moved or spent meanings of the ideology of history or geographic decentred cultures, in relation to Europe.

Literature: Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses", iz *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (New Left Books, 1971); Luj Altise, *Za Marksa* (Nolit, 1971); Slavoj Žižek, *Birokratija i uživanje* (SIC, 1984); Norman Bryson, *Vision and Painting - The Logic of the Gaze*, Yale University Press, New Haven, London, 1983; Slavoj Žižek (ed), *Mapping Ideology* (Verso, 1995); Slavoj Žižek, *Sublimni oblik ideologije* (Arkzin, 2002).

The internet is a global network or global system of inter-connections between computer networks, in other words, a 'network of networks' by which packages of information are transferred through standardized *internet protocols* – *IP*. By internet-communication the 'most' global information connection, i.e. connection and multi-interactive connections are made possible between *millions* of different personal, academic, business, marketing, warring, educated, working, propagandist, informative, entertaining, sexual, cultural, artistic, or servicing networks. The internet enables different serviceable activities such as *electronic mail*, *online chat*, programme transfers, setting up, and maintaining and connecting WEB pages. The internet is a group of mutually-connected computer networks (wire, optical and wireless). The WEB is a group of mutually-connected documents or informational sources of established *hyper-links* and URL's (*Uniform Resource Locator*). Subsequently, the *World Wide Web* is a service which is carried out over the internet.

Research of computer networks and network communication were started in the United States in 1958. Research of 'network communications' were conducted in a military and academic research Cold-War manner (Harvard University, MIT, UCLA, etc). TCP/IP is the internet protocol suite which was established with the use of protocol stack upon which the majority of commercial networks is established. The

first TCP/IP network was set up in 1983. The National Science Foundation – NSF – of the USA ordered a university network with a speed of 56 kilobytes per second in 1985. The use of the web for commercial purposes started in 1988. The commercial web mailing system started in 1989. This is the year that work on commercial ‘providers’ was initiated: UUNET, PSINET, and CERFNET. With TELNET a web system was created by which you could connect thanks to a telephone. This was known as dial-up access. The first international networks were set up during the summer of 1991. The word ‘internet’ was used first in 1996 to symbolise the World Wide Web. The internet is used by 1.133 million people throughout the world, according to statistics collected on June 10, 2007.

The internet became the first big global system, not to the media, but to meta-medial connections in production, exchange, reception and spending of information. In a non-metaphorical sense, the internet networks and networkings can be seen as a ‘global communication’ and an ‘existential’ space. On the other hand, the internet can be seen as a new technological system which extends the human body – for the first time, the human body is not connected to a communicative relationship here and now, but is rather extended into that which the French theoretician, Paul Virilio (1923), named “telepresence”. With the establishment of telepresence, the human relationship towards the uniqueness of space, time, and happening in space and time, has been substantially altered. The technological connectivity of the internet with modern communication technologies (telephone, radio, television) and post-modern technologies (VR- virtual reality, cyber technology) made it so that the internet substantially altered the relationship between real, symbolic and virtual prefiguration and representation, that is, in an ontological sense, the evolution of the human body.

One of the key determinants of internet ‘space’ is the determinant of the internet as a social, political, economic, cultural, artistic and therefore, existential *space*. Next to English (30% of web users), languages in demand are Chinese (14% of web users), Spanish (8% of web users), Japanese (8% of web users), German (5% of web users), French (5% of web users), Korean (3,5% of web users), Arabic (2,5% of web users) etc. In a political sense, questions about the global web as a social space are put out in a similar way to any type of human reality space. A key difference is that the indicated space is almost endlessly multiple and poly-potential in any sense, from presenting identity, facing public and private life, executing power, domination, supervision, control and transfer of capital and produced goods, to crime, exhibitionism, the politics of producing a ‘virus’, internet terrorism, activism or critical and subversive political work, that is, expanding perceptive possibilities, opening invisible mechanisms of society, etc. One specific case of global structuring of ‘human relations’ and representatives of ‘life form’ on the internet is the relationship of virtual work on the internet and life form outside the internet. The current facing up to multiple and hybrid life forms on the internet and outside the internet in a physical space and time, is a problem of new theories and new anthropologies.

For example, according to authors from the artistic and activist group *Critical Art Ensemble* (CAE, established in 1987), every ‘entry’ onto the internet is not a neutral act in a political sense, but a gesture of facing up to global and dynamic politics and economic space: “Only in the time of late capitalism does digitalism become the latent basic principle in economic development” and “With however much complaining from the CAE, they have to admit that the greatest part of the Net is just capitalism. It is a space for repressive comparison, for financial business and capital, as well as for excessive consumption. While a lesser part of the web can be

used for humanitarian purposes and for resistance against an authoritarian structure, its global function is anything but humanitarian. Just like we would not consider an untidy Bohemian quarter representative for a city, we cannot suppose that our small domains of free zones are representative for a digital empire. Nor can we disclose our future with empty promises of an admirer without a heart.” In the dynamics of facing up to the repressive power of capital and the domain of creative and liberating alternatives on the internet, CAE offered the concept of ‘electronic civil disobedience’. According to them, what essentially divides late capitalism from other political and economic forms, is its way of presenting power: “that which was once an immobile concrete mass was transformed into a nomadic electronic trend.” In such conditions, *electronic civil disobedience* is really a process of anarchical and activist individualism and localisation of global spaces and rules and thus a model of supervision and control of symbolic and economic, that is, informative representations or values on the internet. A step further from internet activism is internet terrorism, as a way of carrying out communicative or any other chaotic situation in internet events. One specific phenomenon which was elaborated in CAE actions or Zapatistas was ‘artistic subversion’ and ‘artistic sabotage’ over the internet.

Literature: Verena Andermatt Conley (ed), *Rethinking Technologies* (University of Minnesota Press, 1993); Marina Gržinić, *U redu za virtualni kruh* (Meandar, 1998); Aleksandar Bošković (ed), *Critical Art Ensemble: Digitalni partizani - Izbor tekstova* (CSU, 2000); Rob Shields (ed), *Kulture interneta* (Jasenski i Turk, 2001); Mike Featherstone, Roger Burrows (eds), *Kiberprostor, kibertijela, cyberpunk – Kulture tehnološke tjelesnosti* (Jasenski i Turk, 2001); Geert Lovink (ed), *Uncanny Networks – Dialogues with the Virtual Intelligentsia* (The MIT Press, 2002); Hakim Bej, *T.A.Z. – Temporalna Autonomna Zona, Ontološka Anarhija, Poetski Terorizam* (CSU, 2003), David Gauntlett, Ross Horsley (eds), *Web.Studies* (Edward Arnold Publisher, 2004); Annmarie Chandler, Norie Neumark (eds), *At a Distance – Precursors to Art and Activism on the Internet* (The MIT Press, 2005).

Critical theory, is the name of different materialistic, post-materialistic or neo-materialistic theories of translation and interpretation of contemporary society and culture from the Cold-War block divide through post-historical post-modernism to transitional world and post-block globalism, in the most general sense, at the end of the 20th century.

Sceptical and interventive theories based on analysis, translation, interpretation and discussion of social and cultural systems of representation, exhibition, power, ruling, explanation, identification, tidying up of society and culture, carrying out identity, etc. are called ‘critical theory’.

The name post-critical theories is given to those theories which interpret, exchange discussion, de-centre or deconstruct critique, rather, sceptical analysis, by practices and theories of seduction: (Jean Baudrillard, 1929-2007), pluralism of truth and dissidence (Jean-Francois Lyotard, 1924-1998), textual deconstruction of metaphysics (Jacques Derrida, 1930-2004), enjoyment in texts, writing or views (Roland Barthes, 1915-1980), technological apocalypses (Paul Virilio, 1932, Jean Baudrillard, Donna Haraway, 1944).

In the widest sense, critical theories during the second half of the 20th century are: (1) humanist and Marxist oriented critical theories of the Frankfurt School (Max Horkheimer, 1895-1973, Theodor Ludwig Wiesengrund Adorno, 1903-1969, Herbert Marcuse, 1898-1979) and their followers from from the 1930’s, (2) the development of critical theory in the Frankfurt School during the second half of the 20th century, especially the line of philosophical and social studies connected to the teachings of communicative action by Jurgen Habermass (1929), from the 1970’s, (3) utilising humanistic and critical work (Jean-Paul Sartre, 1905-1980, Theodor Adorno) during the 1940’s, 1950’s and 1960’s, (4) the theory of the new left as a development of the philosophy of Marxism in high modernism and late capitalism (Herbert Marcuse,

Alfred Willi Rudi Dutschke, 1940-1979) during the 1960's and 1970's of the 20th century, (5) structuralist critique of humanism (Claude Levi-Strauss (1908), Louis Althusser (1918-1990), Jacques Lacan, Roland Bart, Dusan Pirjevec, Darko Kolibas) during the late 1950's and early 1960's, (6) the critique of humanism carried out from post-Nietzsche, post-Bataille, and post-Heidegger critique of subjects (Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, and Felix Guattari) during the 1960's and 1970's, (7) structuralist Marxism: Louis Althusser and his followers, for example, Jacques Ranciere (1940), Etienne Balibar (1942), Pierre Macherey (1938), Roger Establet (1938), during the 1960's, (8) post-structuralist materialistic theory, especially Althusser's and later pro-Maoist theory (the circle around *Tel Quela* (1960-1982): Philippe Solers (1936), Julia Kristeva (1940), Marcelin Pleynet (1933), Marc Devade (1943-1983), Roland Bart) in the late 1960's and early 1970's, (9) critical poetics, theory and practice of situationists, rather, a critic of the spectacle society (Guy Debord (1931-1994), during the 1970's, (10) the post-Lacan critical philosophy and theory of capitalism (Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari) from the late 1970's, (11) post-structuralist theory of deconstruction, the *temporary left wing* of Derrida's deconstructivist philosophy from the 1960's, (12) the over-ruling of critical theory and constitution of post-critical theory of late modernism and post-modernism (Roland Bart, Jean Lyotard, Jean Baudrillard, Paul Virilio), (13) neo-Marxist, Anglo-Saxon theory of late-capitalistic society: Fredric Jameson (1934), Martin Jay (1944), Terry Eagleton (1943) from the 1970's, (14) theory of society, culture and art in late and during post-socialism: Mikhail Epstein (1950), Boris Groys (1947), Peter Gyorgy, Gao Minglu, Gerardo Mosquera, as well as Rastko Mocnik (1944), Slavoj Žižek, Marina Grzinic (1958), Ales Erjavec (1959), Boris Buden (1958) from the 1980's (15) British materialistic and post-structuralist theory of culture developed through theory of literature, film, media, mass culture, popular culture, feminism, racial identities (Raymond Williams, 1921-1988, Richard Hoggart, 1918, Stuart Hall, 1932) from the 1970's, (16) American materialistic and post-materialistic theory of culture and sex (Edward W. Said, 1935-2003, Donna Haraway, 1944, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 1942, Homi K. Bhabha, 1947) from the 1970's, (17) in the realms of theories of culture critical theory of sexual identity (Julia Kristev, Helene Cixous, 1937, Judith Butler, 1956) from the 1970's, (18) in the realms of theory of cultural in post-colonial critique (Edward Saide, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak), (19) critical post-Marxist sociology of culture as a theory of consumer society (Pierre Bourdieu, 1930-2002) from the 1970's, (20) neo-Lacan materialistic and critical theory of culture and society (Ernesto Laclau, 1935, Chantal Mouffe, 1943, Alain Badiou, 1937, as well as Slavoj Žižek, Alenka Zupancic, 1966, Mladen Dolar, 1951) during the 1980's and 1990's, (21) bio-politics and critique of globalism developed in the tradition of thought of Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, Giorgio Agamben, Brian Massumi) from the 1990's.

One of the theoretical problems of defining contemporary critical theory is the status of post-structuralism as critical or post-critical or anti-critical theory. It can be said that post-structuralism is not a critical theory of revolutionary, interventive or emancipative practice because it does not represent critical intervention and change of society and culture. However, from comparing theoretical and philosophical literature on post-structuralism, three concepts can be executed: (a) materialistic post-structuralisms (Althusserism, Lacanism, and post-Lacanism, the radical phase of **telkelovska**) and materialistic theories of culture are critical theories of society, and especially culture, (b) textual and textologically-oriented post-structuralism (Derrida's deconstruction, the Yale School) are post-critical theories which are

interactive in the field of text culture (literature, art, philosophy), (c) post-structuralism as a theory and philosophy of eclectic post-modernism of the late 1970's and early 1980's has the status of post-critical, anti-critical and anti-theoretical neo-conservative theory. Also, Anglo-Saxon materialistic theories of culture changed throughout the 1980's and 1990's from critical, cultural theory of late capitalism into a constitutive theory of a reformed post-block world established on the concepts of political correctness, multi or trans-culturalism.

Literature: Patrick French, *The Time of Theory. A History of Tel Quel (1960-1983)* (Clarendon Press, 1995); Fred Rush (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Critical Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2004); [Simon Malpas](#), [Paul Wake](#) (eds), *Routledge Companion to Critical Theory* (Routledge, 2006); [Lois Tyson](#), *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide* (TF-ROUTL, 2006); Simon Tormey, Jules Townshend, *Key Thinkers from Critical Theory to Post-Marxism* (Sage, 2006).

Critical theory of the Frankfurt School is a determinant for theoretical acting of the group of Marxist philosophers, sociologists, social psychologists, economists, literary and legal theoreticians gathered around the Frankfurt *Institut für Sozialforschung- IfS*. The institute was established in 1924 and from 1931 its director was the philosopher Max Horkheimer, the founder of critical theory. Herbert Marcuse, Theodore W. Adorno, Erich Fromm (1900-1980), Walter Benjamin, and others, all worked together in the institute. When Hitler came to power, most of the followers of the so-called *Frankfurt School* went to the United States. After the war, the work of the school is re-established and the most significant representative of its second generation is the philosopher Jürgen Habermas.

Critical theory is a Marxist socio-philosophical analysis and critic of modern civil society. Critical theory is developed through understanding the historical crisis of Western society, which is a result of its expansive capitalistic market and consumer nature. The term critic marks: (1) a theoretical method of research and debate about the legitimacy of social sciences and (2) the relationship between theory and historical practices of society and culture. Representatives of the Frankfurt School abandon classic Marxist formulas of translation society through relationships of base and up-grading, rather, historical trans-individualism, making the problem of the modern individual at the centre of attention. Using Sigmund Freud's (1856-1939) theoretical psycho-analyses, critical theory developed a subject theory. Freud-Marxism is a combination of psycho-analytical theory of the subject and a general critique of social history, social relationships and value exchanges. Unlike dominant Marxist orientation (historical materialism, Leninism, Stalinism, Maoism), critical theory does not reject social, cultural and artistic concepts of modernism, i.e. the concept of modern cultural autonomy and art within society. It develops a social theory of modernism, spreading from the theory of modernism, mass and popular culture, through theories of new media to high modernistic art, neo-avantguardism, the new left, new sensibility, and youth culture. The following theoretical approaches to art differ: (1) analysis and critical debate of actual artistic practices and the culture of modernism (Benjamin), (2) aesthetic theory of modern art (Adorno), (3) a critical analysis of social mechanisms establishing meaning and value in modernistic culture (Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, Habermas), (4) aesthetisation of society as a form of revolutionary struggle in late capitalism (Fromm, Marcuse) and (5) defence of the modernity project and critique of post-modernism as a form of political and social neo-conservatism (Habermas).

Literature: G. E. Rusconi, *Kritička teorija društva* (Stvarnost, 1974); Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, *Sociološke studije* (Školska knjiga, 1980); H. Adams (ed), *Critical Theory Since 1965* (University Press of Florida, 1986); Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, *Dijalektika prosvetiteljstva – filozofijski fragment* (IP Veselin Masleša, 1989); Fred Rush (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Critical Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2004);

Multitude is a philosophical and political concept which is defined as a multitude of subjects. Multitude is a whole which cannot be reduced to an ideal uniqueness or unity. This is why multitude is a whole composed of differences. Multitude of singularity cannot be reduced to people. In modern times, 'people' were the reduction of multitude: "sovereignty for which it is supposed that it has a base in the people and which is spread to the picture of the people".

The concept of 'multitude' is taken from and developed from the political philosophy of Machiavelli (1469-1527), and Baruch de Spinoza (1632-1677). Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt re-interpreted and re-established the concept of 'multitude' leading it into a critical discussion of contemporary globalism and empire. Negri and Hardt's thought about multitude was that it was like singularity made up of unified differences necessary to resolve the contradiction in the reductionist execution of the concepts of people and class. Multitude, therefore, gets the character of 'class' which produces singularity; rather, class which deals in *immaterial work* which is characterised by the globalism era. Multitude as a class is not only a 'class', but rather a creative possibility of work as a whole. And multitude can be seen as an ontological power, like Negri and Hardt stress in many writings. This means that multitude embodies mechanisms which demand a presentation of desire and a transformation of the world. Multitude, therefore, has characteristics of a certain political subject. The resistance which multitude gives to all shapes of 'formatting life' expresses contentment with singularity. Just like Karl Marx saw the beginning of resistance in the 'working class', Negri and Hardt see the potential in resistance in 'multitude', and this means power for carrying out life. Paolo Virno stressed that multitude always means plurality – literally: to be many – as a permanent form of social and political existence, as a confrontation to the cohesive unity of people. Therefore, multitude is made of *individual networks*; many are *singularity*.

Literature: Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003); Antonio Negri, *Negri on Negri: In Conversation with Anne Dufourmentelle* (Routledge, 2004); Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (Penguin Press, 2004); Paolo Virno, *Gramatika mnoštvo - Prilog analizi suvremenih formi života* (Jasenski i Turk, 2004).

Power is the concept carried out in the philosophy of discourse and the philosophy of historical Western society with Michel Foucault (1926-1984). The concept of power is primarily established in the field of discursive knowledge events in which the subject is created, and with this, inter-subjective relations. The concept of power is executed in Foucault's bio-politics as a sign for establishing capability and imposing certain bio-technologies in shaping and controlling every-day life in early bourgeois societies. In the theory of controlling the agency with the concept of power, Foucault solves the interpretations of dynamic relationships between sovereign/sovereignty, discipline (absolutism), supervision (bourgeois capitalism), control (industrial capitalism), and thus regulations, de-regulations and control (the contemporary world: belated and global capitalism). Foucault's concept of the 'power of event' is situated abstractly enough to allow prefiguration, exhibition and interpretation of unified social processes of connecting, shaping, carrying out and evolution of modern society after feudalism. An analysis of power points to the problems of micro and macro power, and thus the infrastructure and technique by which power can be established, imposed and sustained; rather, on the role of power in establishing different types of subjects or models which represent individuality and collectiveness in society, culture or state. Power in modern societies is not realized as an external, abstract dominating force, punishment of supervision or control, but a multitude of differentiating potentials by which a realization of every-day life, from biological, through cultural,

to social life is urged and created. Power, therefore, reaches the individual: his body, his gestures, way of behaviour and acting, from the way in which he consumes food or achieves his sexuality or hygiene to very indirect and bureaucratised forms of acting. As a result of modern power structuring, problems and events occur: demography of public health, hygiene, living conditions, longevity, fertility, education, etc. Foucault therefore explicitly says: "And the political importance of the sexual problem I think, comes from, the fact that it is found at the junction of the discipline of the body and controlling the population". The analysis of power is an analysis of historical and geographical realizations or carrying out these junctions of discipline and control of the body in life.

In bio-politics, the terms 'power' and 'bio-power' are introduced. Similarly to Foucault, power symbolises capability and readiness for ruling, i.e. power (*potere*) of the sovereign/sovereignty, but also *capability* (*potenza*) in its meta-physical assumptions. Bio-power symbolises, according to Negri's interpretation of Foucault, *that* which makes bio-technologies potentially active and bio-political production possible. Bio-power is a form of power which cleans up social life from the inside: following it, interpreting it, absorbing it and re-arranging it. Power, therefore, becomes a part of the life process; that is to say that power is efficient when life has become the object of power. The highest function of that power is that it completely besieges life and its purpose is to control life: "This is how bio-power relates to the status in which production and re-arrangement of life itself is the most important in that power." (Hardt, Negri, *Empire*). To bio-politics, 'bio-power' is substantially important because it refers to the production of life.

Literature: Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003); Mišel Fuko, *Riječi i stvari – Arheologija humanističkih nauka* (Nolit, 1971); Mišel Fuko, *Istorija ludila u doba klasicizma* (Nolit, 1980); Mišel Fuko, *Istorija seksualnosti – Volja za znanjem* (Prosveta, 1982); Mišel Fuko, *Istorija seksualnosti – Korišćenje ljubavnih uživanja* (Prosveta, 1988); Mišel Fuko, *Istorija seksualnosti – Staranje o sebi* (Prosveta, 1988); Mišel Fuko, *Predavanja* (IP "Bratstvo -jedinstvo", 1990); Michel Foucault, *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology* (Penguin Books, 1994); Michel Foucault, *Nadzor i kazna – rađanje zatvora* (FPZ, 1994); Michel Foucault, *Znanje i moć* (Globus, 1994); Michel Foucault, *Ethics – Subjectivity and Truth* (Penguin Books, 1997); Mišel Fuko, *Arheologija znanja* (Plato, 1998); Mišel Fuko, *Treba braniti društvo – Predavanja na Kolež de Fransu iz 1976. godine* (Svetovi, 1998); Mišel Fuko, *Nenormalni – Predavanja na Kolež de Fransu 1974-1975* (Svetovi, 2001); Mišel Fuko, *Hermeneutika subjekta – Predavanja na Kolež de Fransu 1981-1982* (Svetovi, 2003).

National-realism, crudely and metaphorically, are the names given to artistic productions which by traditional means of expression and exhibiting (figuratively Staffelein painting, scenic painting, monumental sculptures, architecture of national styles, traditional ethnically-centred folklorism and different folklore and urban naives, a narrative patriotic theater, television series or film) re-establish *styles* or *manners* of the past (national style, folklore style, early civil art, 19th century romanticism, and more rarely, bourgeois realism) and re-actualise them as anti-communist, anti-modernistic and anti-Western strategies, in the sense of anti-European and anti-American art. In national-realism, the concepts of national, religious, political, and more rarely, racial, original, exceptional, closer and paradoxically, trans-historicism as a universally-supposed authenticity, are projected. The phantasm of origin and authentic collectivity is thoroughly installed in these types of populistically-oriented art practices. Questions are posed about the re-establishment of national and religious 'being' within post-socialist societies as anti-communist and anti-capitalistic societies. These forms of expression are connected, in a political sense, with heterogeneous 'corps' of *patriotic forces* and new tycoon elites, which means with anti-overlooked political and militarised 'force' – in Foucault's words: power – within post-socialism in eastern and south-eastern Europe. This

militarised 'patriotic force' is created by connecting national right-wing political parties with power machines of real-socialist institutions which have lost their left-wing (that is, real-socialist or self-regulated start-up) political profile. Art, which comes from that type of shelter, is absolutely realistically romantic by cliché and politically traditional, i.e. nationally-religiously didactic and claustrophobic.

Literature: Miško Šuvaković, "Umetnost i realističke sablasti kulture" (*Život umjetnosti*, br. 64, 2001, str. ???); Miško Šuvaković, *Pojmovnik suvremene umjetnosti* (Horetzky, 2003); Sezgin Boynik, Minna L. Henriksson (eds), *Contemporary Art and Nationalism* (Prishtine Institute for contemporary art 'EXIT' i MM – Center for Humanistic Studies 'Gani Bobi', 2007); Ravzan Ion, Eugen Radescu (eds), „What was Socialism, and what Comes Next?“ (*Pavilion* #10-11, 2007).

Nancy, Jean-Luc (1940) is a French philosopher who developed his work to the interpretation of the French 'radical philosophical inheritance' from George Bataille (1897-1962) and Jacques Lacan, to Jacques Derrida, in the direction of reconstruing the western philosophy of the world. He graduated with a degree in philosophy in 1962. He received his PhD in 1987 under the mentorship of Gerard Granel and in front of a commission which comprised of Jean-Francois Lyotard and Jacques Derrida at the University of Toulouse. His thesis was: *The Experience of Freedom* (*L'expérience de la liberté*, 1988). He is a professor of philosophy at the University in Strasbourg. Nancy and **Laclau-Labart** organised conferences about Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) and politics by the name of "The End of Man" (*Les Fins de l'Homme*) in 1980.

One of his most important philosophical theses was aimed at the question of the extreme philosophical prefiguration of the modern world and the possibility of contemporary thought in philosophy as humanity. He actually asks about the possibility of contemporary thought which takes place in wasting, re-arranging, and fermenting the 'community'. The relationship between man and community in thought are shown as a concrete problem in Nancy's philosophical activities.

With his debates in globalism, Nancy offered the concept of 'mondialisation' or 'creating of the world'. In his book *Creating the World of Mondialisation* (*La création du monde ou la mondialisation*), Nancy started from the philologically-archeological concept of 'globalism' pointing to the concept of 'gathering' which is contained in the Greek source of the word 'globus'. This is about concepts of prefiguring political projects of domination and conquests, whose goal was not just searching for the unknown and leaving one world to go to the next, but rather an intention for obtaining and gathering wealth. The fight for gathering, i.e. endless gathering of wealth is in the heart of contemporary expansive economic and political globalism, which by gathering wealth, is shown as carrying out greater and greater power. This is why modern globalisations in an uncontrolled and unbalanced expansion turn out to be 'a bad endlessness' or, if we paraphrase Kant's syntagm, we can say that *we do not live in a global age* but rather, in an inter-space of globalisation. Nancy gave the concepts 'globalism' and above all, 'globalisation' an alternative concept: 'mondialisation'. The world which he relates to is the world of 'intersubjectivity' and this means: possibilities of community and societal relationships which bring the contemporary man back with political questions which are faced with the fact that the 'unity of the world' is not one, rather, it is made up of varieties and inequalities and thus differences: "The world is a multitude of worlds, this world is a multitude of worlds, and its uniqueness is the mutual sharing and exhibiting of all its worlds in one world".

Literature: Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Experience of Freedom* (Stanford University Press, 1993); Jean-Luc Nancy, *Dva ogleđa: Razdjelovljena zajednica & O singularnom pluralnom bitku* (Multimedijalni institut, 2004); Jacques Derrida, *On Touching, Jean-Luc Nancy* (Stanford University Press, 2005); Jean-Luc Nancy, *Stvaranje svijeta ili*

omdalizacija (Jasenski i Turk, 2004); Stefan Nowotny, „Postoji li sviojet antiglobalizma?“ (Zarez VIII/192, 2006, str. 10-13) Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Creation of the World or Globalization* (SUNY Press, 2007);

Negri, Antonio (1933) is an Italian Marxist philosopher and activist. He was born in Padova. During his youth in the 1950's, he was an activist in the Catholic youth organisation *Gioventu Italiana di Azione Cattolica (GIAC)*. He approached the Italian Socialist Party in 1956 and left it in 1963. Since then he works in various radical political groups and movements. He received his PhD in political theory from the University of Padova. In the early 1960's, he joined the Marxist magazine and the group *Quaderni Rossi* which worked outside the influence of the Italian Communist Party. He was the co-founder of the group "Working Class" (*Potere Operaio*) and the movement "Workers" (*Operaismo*). The movement "Organised Working Autonomy" or "Autonomism" (*Autonomia Operaia Organizzata*) united with the "Working Class" group from 1973. Numerous workers, students, and feminists cooperated with the autonomist movement. Antonio Negri was arrested with other members of the *Autonomist Movement* on April 7, 1979. The arrests were carried out because the *Autonomist Movement* was accused of being a wing of the Red Brigades (*Brigate Rosse*), a terrorist organisation which kidnapped the Italian Prime Minister, Aldo Moro. At the time, Negri was a professor of political science at the University of Padova and a guest lecturer at the *Ecole Normale Supérieure* in Paris. In 1984, Negri was sentenced to thirty years in prison because of his collaboration with the Red Brigades, and two years later, was sentenced to an additional four and a half years in prison because of his moral responsibilities for the violence in conflicts between activists and the police during the 1960's and 1970's. During the 1980's, the organisation Amnesty International pointed out the irregularities in the autonomist trials. It was claimed that the political and active connection between the Autonomist Movement, Antonio Negri and the Red Brigades was never proven. The French philosophers Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari gave their support to Negri and opposed the political repression in Italy. Guattari and Deleuze signed an "Appeal from French intellectuals against the repression in Italy" (*L'Appel des intellectuels français contre la repression en Italie*) in 1977. Negri spent four years in prison before his trial, and then in 1983, was elected to the Italian Parliament as a member of the Radical Party of Marco Pannella (1930). He illegally left Italy when he was released from jail as a member of parliament. He spent fourteen years in France. This was made possible by the declaration of the French President Mitterand about Italian political emigrants who were not directly involved in carrying out terrorist killings. Negri thenafter lectured at the *Universite de Paris VIII-Saint Denis* and the *College International de Philosophie*. He was a co-founder of the magazine *Futur Anterieur* which was published between 1990 and 1999. He also started the magazine *Multitudes* with an international editorial staff in 2000. He went back to Italy to serve the rest of his sentence, which was reduced to seventeen years in 1997. He left prison after completing his time in 2003.

Negri's critical political philosophy was developed in the context of Marxism, democratic globalisation, anti-capitalism, post-modernism, critique of neo-liberalism, and thus the development of multitude and cohesiveness, that is, the political nature of love. His philosophically-theoretical method was established on the repeated questioning and findings of political concepts: "Everything has to be discovered again". Negri's starting point was in the European baroque and rational philosophy of Rene Descartes and Baruch de Spinoza, and Marx's political and critical theory of capitalism. His philosophical and theoretical work is established between French and Italian philosophical culture as a creative dialogue between radical post-structuralism

(Derrida, Foucault, Deleuze, Guattari) and Italian new philosophy, often called *biopolitics*. He worked with the philosopher and literary theoretician Michael Hardt with whom he wrote one of the most famous and popular critical-theory books on the transition between the 20th and 21st centuries: *Empire* (2000). In the book *Empire*, basic left-wing anti-globalism and democratic globalism against imperial capitalistic globalism are established.

Literature: Félix Guattari, Antonio Negri, *Communists Like Us* (1985); Antonio Negri, *The Politics of Subversion: A Manifesto for the Twenty-First Century*, (Polity Press, 1989); Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri *Labor of Dionysus: A Critique of the State-Form* (University of Minnesota Press, 1994); Antonio Negri *Insurgencies: Constituent Power and the Modern State* (University of Minnesota Press, 1999); Antonio Negri, *Time for Revolution* (Continuum, 2003); Antoni Negri, Michael Hardt, *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003); Antonio Negri, *Negri on Negri: In Conversation with Anne Dufourmentelle* (Routledge, 2004); Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (Penguin Press, 2004); Timothy S. Murphy, *Michael Hardt*, Ted Stolze, Charles T. Wolfe (eds) *Antonio Negri, Subversive Spinoza: (Un)Contemporary Variations* (Manchester University Press, 2004); Timothy S. Murphy, Abdul-Karim Mustapha (eds), *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri*, vol. 1: *Resistance in Practice* (Pluto Press, 2005); Timothy S. Murphy, Abdul-Karim Mustapha (eds), *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri*, vol. 2: *Revolution in Theory* (Pluto Press, 2007); Antonio Negri, *Political Descartes: Reason, Ideology and the Bourgeois Project* (Verso, 2007); Sylvere Lotringer, Christian Marazzi, *Autonomia: Post-Political Politics* (Semiotext(e), 1980, 2007).

Neoliberalism is an open and often contradictory political platform by which the conception and horizon of economic liberalism as an instrument of sustaining permanent expansive economic development, and thus securing political and individual human rights, is projected. Neoliberalism is a philosophy in which the processes of the market are estimated as autonomous and separated from former relations within the production of goods and services. Neoliberalism is therefore defined as a ‘doctrine’ that market activity is ethical by itself and from itself, and thus becomes the dominant paradigm determinant of all other human activities and shapes of life in society. Neoliberalism is a *political protocol* about the reconstitution of state competencies and power in relation to economic demands of the permanent and expansive market development which is carried out by means of privatising finances and globalisation of the market. State interventions in economics are lessened, the result being the abolition or minimisation of state politics in the field of general human protection (pensions, social security, free education), standards and every-day life securities in modern societies.

During the 1990’s, the term ‘neoliberalism’ has been interpreted as a mark for ‘global market capitalism’ and politics of a free market, in left-wing political activist discourse. Some authors equalise the concepts of ‘neoliberalism’ and ‘globalism’, i.e. globalisation of the market and capital. In left-wing critique, globalism shows itself as an unconfined and expansive practice of the globalisation of capital and thus a radical limitation to the globalisation of ‘life’ and ‘life’s course’.

Economic liberalism is one of the theories set up in the age of enlightenment, and is to a great extent defined by the work of Adam Smith, (1723-1790) who believed in minimal interventionism of the state in socio-economic dealings. Economic liberalism was established on axiomatic assumptions of capitalistic, free markets, and its development from bourgeois liberalism of the 18th century to colonial capitalism of the 19th and early 20th centuries, until the execution of the contemporary global economic market. Significant neo-conservative philosophers and theoreticians associated with the evolution of liberalism are: the *liberal thinker* John Rawls (1921-2002), the philosopher of pragmatism and post-modernism Richard McKay Rorty (1931-2007), the philosopher and neo-pragmatic aesthetician Richard Shusterman (1949), the theoretician and economist Yoshihiro Francis Fukuyama (1952), the philosopher and aesthetician Arthur C. Danto (1924), and the businessman, philanthropist and activist George Soros (1930), as well as others.

Contemporary neoliberalism is based on the principles of total market globalisation and centring political, legal, and ethic principles of individual-pragmatic freedoms as thorough political presumptions. Neoliberalism is interpreted in relation with new conservatism of economic, political and ethical schools, so-called 'liberal conservatism' and 'neo-conservatism' in society, politics, economics, culture and art in the era of post-modernism. In a historical sense, neoliberalism refers to the revival of philosophy and theories of economic liberalism between western economists and politicians between the early 1970's and the early years of the first decade of the 21st century. By this term, 'neo-classic economic-theoretical' influences are identified, as are right 'libertarianism' and the critique of state influences on all socio-economic processes. The name neo-classic economy is given to platforms of economic price-determining and distribution of goods on the market in the role of demand and supply. In the USA, above all, the name right libertarianism is given to political theories and practices of highlighting traditional pragmatic individual freedoms from clear demarcation of the relationship of the church and state to the right of individual ownership and use of firearms.

Neoliberalism is established as a hybrid multitude of diverging theories on the unbuilding of national sovereignty in the name of global development of the market, circulation of capital, and above all, the western individualised system of 'values'. The neoliberal platform has become influential after the economic crises (stagnation and inflation) of the 1970's, and then after the debt crisis of the 1980's and definitely after the disintegration of the USSR and the eastern real-communist block at the end of the 1980's and beginning of the 1990's.

The traits of neoliberalism are numerous: centring the role of political execution and spreading the breadth of economic transactions in society, establishing the importances of agreed social and economic politics, the relevance of managerial intermediary work in the circulation of capital, carrying out social activities by means of market processes, professional differentiations of work competencies, producing the semblance of market relations in non-market practices, instigating wealth and the role of the wealthy in structuring public social life, separating political and social, a change of the work market in the semblance of market *non-material work* or, more accurately, a change of all forms of work in carrying out service work, creating a semblance that production work is realized as servicing market work, de-biologisation of life and emphasizing 'artificial' post-experience norms in place of deciding within the singular forming of every-day life, pointing out that contemporary society and its market processes are outside of the social contradiction and struggle, showing that the social struggle is for power, actually, one kind of ethically-determined market competition for a new and increased income, etc. The neoliberal model brought about a turnover from liberal conceptions of techno-bureaucratic executions of economic, political and social relationships of production in the international market as well, towards conceptions of executing all forms of social activities by looking towards managerial practices as an example.

The theory and philosophy of neoliberalism is connected to the Austrian-British economist and political philosopher Friedrich Hayek (1899-1992), the Austrian School of Economics, the Economics Department at the University of Chicago, and by international economic organisations such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Among the relevant theoreticians of economic and philosophic neoliberalism, Milton Friedman (1912-2006) and Arnold C. Harberger (1924) stand out, among others.

The expansion of neoliberalism clashes with the establishment of the new world order and carrying out 'empire' or 'imperial politics' from the United States' government and multi or trans-national capitalistic organisations. This is where a thorough paradox of neoliberalism is shown, which primarily promises a critique and destruction of every national 'sovereignty' in the name of global circulation of capital, and is thus in 'reality' shown as a discourse to dispute local sovereignties in the name of global imperial sovereignty which is proclaimed and carried out by the United States. After the end of the block division of the world, neoliberal global politics found themselves in new binary or triadic conflict schemes: the West against Islam, North against South, and the first world against the second and third worlds etc.

Literature: "Nova Američka ideologija – Samuel Huntington i polemički Dossier" (*Europski glasnik* vol. IX br. 9, 2004, str. 221-330); "O, liberalizmu" (*Teći program RB* br. 127-128, 2005, str. 9-143); [Alfredo Saad-Filho](#), [Deborah Johnston](#) (eds), *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader* (Pluto Press, 2005); David Harvey, [A Brief History of Neoliberalism](#) (Oxford University Press, 2006); David Harvey, *Spaces of Global Capitalism: A Theory of Uneven Geographical Development* (Verso, 2006); [Aihwa Ong](#), *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty* (Duke University Press, 2006); Jeremy Lane, *Bourdieu's Politics: Problems and Possibilities* (Routledge, 2006).

Neoliberalism and art. Neoliberal economic and political theory and philosophy do not have specific registers of the theoretisation of art, although essential influences of neoliberal organisations of global social formations on the character of structuring the world of art, do exist. During the late 1980's and 1990's, in late capitalism, and then in neoliberal globalism, essential changes of creative (poetic), media (productive), organized (custodial), communicative (distributive: exhibitional, promotional) and economic (financial turnover) character of art practices and its autonomies within culture and society came about. These changes were anticipated in late capitalism when it came to relativising relationships of high elitist and popular mass art in post-modern society. The second important application was connected to the change of general human perception and the character of human work in the contemporary world. This is about the turn-over from creative-productive work in techno-media-medium and manager-organised work to culturally, rather, art practices. Artistic work is pre-structured from the concept of deed to the concept of project, and the practice of creating pieces (actually, masterpieces) is converted into a practice of researching art, culture, and society. In this kind of constellation, the operational poetic relationship of the 'artist – critic – the exhibition's public' is pre-structured into a relationship of 'custodian – artist – media and festival public'. The custodian is depicted as an active coordinator, organiser and initiator of art projects and of their economic and institutional presentations.

My, and not only my thesis, is that painting and sculpture after-conceptual art, for example, from the middle of the 1970's, do not have a historical logic of straight-line development, i.e shifts of art styles, individual poetics or appearances (isms and arts). Everything is comparable and possible with multiple return couplings within a weak floating art world and cultural contexts. An untidy and uncontrolled field of plural performing and media possibilities and their reproductions is in question. It is not about *post-history*, as post-modern theoreticians assumed (Jean-Francois Lyotard, Achille Bonito Oliva, Arthur C. Danto), but about a *crazed-maddened-history* which is falling apart entropically and spreads and becomes a scholarly thing or the fascinating 'liberalised' and 'arbitrarily-initiated' spectacle between the eye and body, rather, the visual and haptic, rather, the individual and collective. The work of any artist and any *strategy, gesture, or procedure* (trans-avantgarde, neo-expressionism, anachronism, ne-expressionsim, neo-conceptual arts, simulation, retro-avantgarde,

soc art, cynical realism, post-pop art, net art, cyber art, etc.) is legitimate. There is no difference between a canvas painting and a digitally-generated picture on the screen, that is, between a lone work on a painting in a studio and a spectacle art according to the *rules* of mass culture. Art is portrayed as a field of uncontrolled possibilities of liberal networking of distributive custodial and art centres within the first, second, and third worlds. The lack of control is *essentially* the capacity of art which takes place in the era of neoliberal globalisation. Entering into painting, exiting from painting. Leaving art. Ravaging the profession of artists and obsessively invoking the traditional role of the painter tradesman-workman.

In the artistic context of the USA, this change takes place through the fragmentation of gallery, paramedial neo-conceptualism in special models of representation and presenting *ideals*, and maybe, semblances of *multi-cultural society*: a society without ethnic, racial, sexual, a culture of indifferentiated forefronts and without obvious tensions, i.e. social conflicts. In other words, the means of elitist autonomous art, for example, neo-conceptualism and neo-expressionism, are used in recording 'appearances' of small or marginal cultures (Mexicans, Pakistanis, Puerto-Ricans, Chinese, Russians, South-Africans, Algerians, Yermenis, Serbs in the United States) by their introduction and visual recognition and omnipresence of mass culture of late capitalism in the stage of globalism. Therefore, local ethnic folklores receive a modern media and trans-nationally recognised language, with which they set up a paradoxical relationship between local procedures and global distribution which paint a relationship between local productions of social relations and the global market.

In the artistic sense of Europe, there is a move which is caused by the break-up of realsocialism (eastern block) and a creating of *western institutions* whose function is to instigate, start-up and distribute trans-actional processes to the East (from the former USSR states, through to the *communist* states of central Europe to the Balkans). Instigating, starting up and distributing these processes is also made possible by the *Centre for Contemporary Art (SCCA) Fund for an Open Society* or 'Soros' for short. Initially, the centres were established as institutions which allowed documentation of the local art scene, financing of actual art projects and represented trans-national emancipated *local arts* on the international scene. With time, the centres united in financial, communicative, exhibitional, promotional, and educational *networks* in cutting-out or bridging the *East in Transition* and the *West in Globalisation*. What was characteristically shown very quickly with the creation of the Centres, was the appearance of a *similar new art* in completely different and often, uncomparable local cultures. Stories and prefigured cases were different, but the means, i.e. poetic presentations, expressions and communication were completely comparable. Roughly speaking, this is most likely not about an already *mapped-out* plan and programme, but it is certainly not about some kind of metaphysic like *Zeitgeist!?!* I suppose it is about the relationship between *function, structure* and *effect*. This means, that the function of the institution which *reconfigures art* accordingly with non-artistic demands, is in question:

- (i) *globally*: starting up transitions in eastern-European cultures,
- (ii) *poetically*: emancipation from the elitist autonomous-artistic modernism and post-modernism in a practical-artistic and theoretically-interpretive sense,
- (iii) *culturally*: the turn-over from 'alternative' (emancipated urban) art as a marginal art of national culture, which has between popular and high culture, in the *art-sond* with which they are tested, projected and represented the strategies of relativism of the relationships of margins and centres in every

- concrete individual society; in other words, culture alone becomes the 'material' and the 'medium' of happening in the aim of anticipation and realisation of a *non-conflictual* (politically correct) society, and
- (iv) *politically*: a work of art becomes an *exhibited media project* by means which realises political toning, but not a completely explicit practice and production of samples which promise *realistic activities within civil society*, which should just begin to appear and by that, they are really neutralising the conditions in which the critical, cynical, subversive and completely obviously, nihilistic soc art, perestroika, cynical realism and retro-avantgarde existed and presented themselves.

By this, the formula for the 'genesis' of artwork as a project which *enters the processes of supported and stimulated distribution*, is created. The ontology of work receives a recognisable morphology: (a) new media (global) + (b) local and regional themes = (c) a display 'of' erased traces of culture.

Another interesting controversy is observed. The model which is established for marginal or other cultures, for example, Mexican, Puerto-Rican or eastern-European, are now through exhibitions of the *Manifest* and similar exhibitions under the influence of the *Centres* (for example, *After the Wall*) used on *small or peripheral* western-European cultures such as Swedish, Dutch, Danish, Belgian, Greek, etc. By these, they get involved in an 'emancipatory' horizon of equalising multi-cultural and global societies at the end of the 20th century.

This is why I used the term *soros realism*, totally without irony, on an occasion for artistic productions which support the SCCA. This term literally points to artwork which:

- (a) has a function (**vidi i-iv**)
- (b) has a relationship of prefiguring and representing according to actual reality of society and culture (sees the formula $/a/ + /b/ = /c/$), and
- (c) has an 'optimal projection', which means a positive social impact of change (emancipation, education) which is represented through artwork.

Soros realism is not a realism in the sense of going back to the painter's paranoid, nationalistic type of realism, which is developed in most post-socialist societies in the 1990's, and is not a brutal version of socialist realism which established canons of expression in the 1930's, 1940's 1950's and 1960's in the East, but rather, it is a *soft* and *subtle* equalisation and standardisation of post-modern pluralism and multi-culturalism as the criteria for enlightened political liberalism which needs to be realised by European societies at the transition into the new century. A specific benefit of this kind of approach is the moving away from 'limited' (totally elitist) emancipation, which high art and the alternative carry, to general social emancipation in the framework of the given local culture. For example, theories of post-structuralism and the value of liberalism which have a character of 'university' or 'museum-like' but definitely a 'minority intellectual' discourse, now *through* art become discourse, the flavour and value of 'normal' culture of the just-established middle-class, intellectual level of society and its public opinion (*doxe*). The actual deficiency of this type of approach to art is establishing 'average visibility' which realizes artistic and aesthetic goals like the culture of determined effects. In other words, the artwork of the youth, of the marginal, and of *those in transition* gets a

mobile reserve of promised possibilities of survival and realisation within the domination of global market processes.

The French custodian and theoretician Nicolas Bourriaud (1965) determined the contemporary art practice – by pointing to the ontological change of art in the direction of creating autonomous artwork, towards an obvious neo-liberal managerial, i.e. custodial organisation of the art world as a dynamic field of ‘relational projects’ and ‘post-productive practices’. The French philosopher Yves Michaud (1944) set up a thought of changing artwork as a completed piece in a ‘**auratsko**’ field of cultural effects. He wrote about art in a gaseous state. In this context, the concept of art as a production was replaced with art as a performing cultural favour in systems with cultural politics, like in tourism, the politics of entertainment, etc.

Probably one of the most vivid examples of neoliberal cultural politics is the appearance of the so-called *young British art* in the 1990’s. By new or young British art of the 1990’s, a provocative, shocking and cynical art is identified, with eclectically foreseen globally-shaped approaches and specifically, local British cultural references. Young British art is linked to students from *Goldsmiths College* in London and was initially supported by trade artists such as Karsten Schubert, Jay Jopling and Saatchi Gallery. Artists of the new British art are: Damien Hirst, Dinos and Jake Chapman, Tracey Emin, Anya Gallaccio, Sarah Lucas, Jenny Saville, Mat Collishaw, and Abigail Lane.

Literature: Julian Stallabrass, *High ArtLite – The Rise and Fall of Young British Art* (Veeso, 1999); Nicolas Bourriaud, *Postproduction – Culture as Screenplay: How Art Reprograms the World* (Lukas&Sternberg, 2002); Nikolas Burio, “Relaciona estetika” (*Košava* br. 42-43, 2003); Yves Michaud, *Umjetnost u plinovitom stanju – eseji o trijumfu estetike* (Naklada Ljevak, 2004); Gilane Tawadros (ed), *Changing States – Contemporary Art and Ideas in an Era of Globalisation* (Institute of International Visual Arts, 2004); Brandon Taylor, *Art Today* (Laurence King Publishing, 2005); [Barbara Vanderlinden](#), Elena Filipović (eds), *The Manifesta Decade: Debates on Contemporary Art Exhibitions and Biennials in Post-Wall Europe* (The MIT Press, 2006).

New media in art are art practices established upon introducing ‘new media’ in a traditionally-defined context of art discipline. More precisely, new media is the name given to different art practices established on the innovative work with artistic or non-artistic media. New media art practices are basically introducing non-standardised media in a standardised and usually closed art discipline. For example, new media are introductions of photographic, film or video work in the contexts of painting and sculpture. New media is also the name given to experimental research with relationships of different traditional, or new media, in the framework of traditionally-defined mono-media practices. New media is for example, the name given to all those hybrid artistic practices which are created by a combination of more media (*mixed media*, multi-media, poly-media, expanded media, art and technology, computer art, cyber art, etc). Finally, new media is the name given to exactly those artistic practices which are created due to the programming of artwork (computer art, digital art, cyber art, bio-technological art). The determinant of ‘new media’ as programmable art practices at the experimental level or user work is a distinction of new-media artwork in the age of globalism, because programmability appears as a globally totalitarian practice of tidying up and carrying out art work between high and popular culture.

Parallel to the term ‘new media’, the term ‘meta-media’ can be used, as it was defined by Lev Manovic. Meta-media or post-media are, according to Lev Manovic, computer multi-media and computer communication networks, being that new computer multi-media use old media as their basic material of programme simulation. In modernism, by finding new mechanical and electronic media reproductions (from photographic light-chemical labelling of pictures and phonographic marking of

sounds, to electro-magnetic synchronised labelling of pictures and sounds) it comes to an accumulation of media or technical inscriptions of reality. The key interest of modernism, as the avant-garde of the old media, is the founding of new forms, i.e. finding different ways to completely humanise and objectify the estranged picture of the world which mechanical and electronic media technologies give. The avant-garde of the new media does not deal with observing and showing the outside world in a new way anymore, but is rather aimed towards new ways of access and using previously accumulated media data. Meta-media art and culture are established on digital computers as a relevant technology for cultivation of information and representing or simulating all other media. The new avant-garde of the 1990's deals with new ways of accessing and manipulating information. Its techniques are hyper-media, data-bases, searchers, comparing data, cultivating pictures, visualisation and simulation. The new informative worker does not access the material reality directly, but instead uses media records and is preoccupied with previously accumulated records and illustrations, that is, the possibilities of their transformation. It comes to complete instability and transfiguration in which the instrumentarium of social struggle is brought into politics, science, or every-day organisation in the way of simulating and designing an aesthetic experience. A contemporary aesthetic experience is not autonomously formulated through art, but through public and mass media (computer-net-computer) in cultural production, exchange, and consumption. The media and their effects are open cultural weapons which can become anything through software manipulation: an eco-system, a paradigm of science, a political atmosphere, a pornographic object, a specification of art, but also a factory, a shopping mall and a private place for production, exchange and consumption of material effects (software) symbolic to manipulation. The word is about total ambiguity, which Lev Manovic describes as an ongoing expansion of possibilities. The possibility of creating a stable new language is also subverted by constant introduction of new techniques. This is how new media not only offer many more options but the old continue to grow and spread with time. In a culture where the logic of fashion prevails, this is a demand for constant innovation, and artists lean towards endlessly accepting new available interfaces, modes of networking, cultural options and rejecting those which are familiar to them. Every year, every month, every day, new effects are set forth which emphasise those which dominated earlier and therefore destabilise every stable expectation which the viewers and consumers can develop. According to Manovic, from *new visions, new typographies, new architecture of the 1920's*, the new media of the 1990's came about; *from the man with the film camera* (Dziga Vertov, 1896-1954) to the user equipped with a seeker, a programme for the analysis of pictures, programmes for visualisation; from film, the technology of watching, we came to computers, memorising technologies; from astonishment to informative design. Shortly, avant-garde becomes software. This display should be understood in two ways. On the one hand, software codifies and naturalises the shapes of the old avant-garde. On the other hand, new principles of the software approach to media demonstrate the new avant-garde of meta-media society. Art in the era of multi-media, mass and global multi-medial computer technologies of production, exchange and consumption, becomes a type of designing like the organisation and the production of new (arbitrary and artificial) social realities (various systems of prefiguration, assumptions and identifications).

Literature: Lev Manovič, *Metamediji, izbor tekstova* (CSU, 2001); Michael Rush, *New Media in Late 20th-Century Art* (Thames and Hudson; 2001); Brian Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation (Post-Contemporary Interventions)* (Duke University Press, 2002); Christiane Paul, *Digital Art* (Thames and Hudson, 2003); Mark B.N. Hansen, *New Philosophy for New Media* (The MIT Press, 2004).

A **signifier** is linguistically and semiologically described as a constitutive, material part of the sign, which by appearance or acting represents concept, or rather, meaning and point. According to linguist Ferdinand De Saussure, virtues of *acoustic pictures*, i.e. *the carrier of the sign* or the marking are arbitrary (arbitrariness) and differentiability (differentiation): “We suggest that we keep the word *sign* (signe) for the name of the whole, and that *concept* and *acoustic image* are replaced by *signified*, rather *signification*; these last two terms have the advantage because they underline the difference which separates them, be it mutual or be it from the whole which they belong to”. According to Roland Barthes, the *signified* is not a *thing* but a psychological or conceptual representation of things. For example, the marked word ‘house’ is not a structure in which one can live but rather its conceptual representation. The *signifier* is that which is in a relational relationship with the *signified*. Barthes shows that the *signifier* is a pure *relative* or *relationship*. Moreover, he adds that the *signifier* is an intermediary which needs matter, but it is not enough for it to become a sign which is realised just through the relationship of the *signified* and the *signifier*.

The influential metaphysics of the *signifier* was developed by the psychiatrist and founder of theoretical psycho-analysis, Jacques Lacan. Unconsciously, according to Lacan, the domain of signs, i.e. is the formation of the signifier’s inter-connection. Because he unconsciously interpreted in the way of structuralised thinking, like a *signifier’s chain* or *system*: (a) he released the unconscious biological meaning and references towards physiological interpretation of the unconscious, (b) he released the expressive components and set up the unconscious as a system, i.e. a systematic relationship, (c) by this, he brought closer the structuring of the unconscious and language, he achieved starting-up the development of subject theory, which does not start from biological urges and cultural impulses, but rather from the place of the subject in language, (d) he argued that the mechanisms of the unconscious, in some aspects, coincide with mechanisms of language, (e) he linked language to subject, showing that the *signifier* always belongs to a subject, by which he set up the theory of subject to be *anti-humanist* – the subject is not at the forefront of the theory but rather the signifier from the language system, which determines the subject or through which the subject is determined, as well as the relationship between the subjects. Lacan changed De Saussure’s formula of the linguistic sign which is determined by the relationship of the *signified* (thought, concept) and the *signifier* (sound, sign carrier, matter) and expressed it with a **matem**: O/o, which is read: “Signifier through signified”, where the line between the signifier and the signified has the character of a *barrier*. A *barrier* is that which divides and distances. Lacan’s dialectic of signs is characterised by the domination of the signifier over the signified. Sexual orientation of the used metaphor is obvious. The signifier fits the ideal of the phallus, it is marked as passive, the produced element, and maybe the victim of the signifier. A symbolic barrier shows resistance to establishing meaning, and thus, the sign at the moment when the signifier *penetrates* the signified. Lacan gave many, often contradicted, *definitions of the signifier* in a wide span from linguistic post-Saussure determinants through materialistic interpretations to the subject of meta-physics in the field of signified relationships:

1. the signifier is the hearing material, which, however, does not mean sound,

2. the signifier is a sign which does not point to an object, which does not realise the function of referring (pointing out) on that which is outside the signs in the world,
3. the signifier should be understood as something different from meaning, it is different because it is itself without meaning,
4. the signifier has its own laws irrespective of the signified,
5. the sign becomes a signifier, the moment where sense is taken away, pure materialism, a neutral point which is open to accepting different senses, that is, the signifier is not that which precedes the sign, but it is rather the signifier which is left from the sign,
6. the signifier is an instrument which is used to express the disappearance of the signified,
7. the signifier is an imperative, i.e. without structuring the signifier, no transmission of thought is possible,
8. the signifier should be understood as the material of language, and language is not immaterial,
9. the signifier is a sign which points to another sign, which is structured in a way to signify the absence of another sign,
10. the signifier is *meaningless*, it is *stupid*, because it acquires meaning like the letters of a typing machine, only when it erases another signifier taking its place on the already-written sheet of paper,
11. the signifier is seen in the movement which is comparable with the movement in shining advertisements or backward computer memories,
12. the signifier is the whole of the deficit,
13. the signifier materialises death,
14. the signifier has the *function of a phallus*, so it has an active function in determining efficiencies in which that which is flexible in signifying shows up like that which bears the input of the signifier, becoming signified through that wish,
15. the signifier can only work if it is present in the subject, that is, the signifier can only work if it is put in its own creation – the subject is its creation,
16. the function of the signifier is determined only by the relationship with other signifiers,
17. one signifier represents the subject for another signifier,
18. for one signifier every other signifier can represent the subject,
19. one signifier represents the subject for all other signifiers, or
20. the signifier is that which represents the subject for one other signifier, and this signifier will therefore be the signifier because of whom all other signifiers represent the subject; in the absence of this signifier, all the others would represent nothing.

Still, that characteristic and constantly repeated definition of *signifier* in Lacan's theoretical psycho-analysis is as follows: "Our definition of signifier (there is no other) is: the signifier is that which represents the subject for one other signifier. This signifier will therefore be, the signifier for which all other signifiers represent the subject: this means that in the absence of this signifier, all the others would not represent anything. Because all which is represented, is represented for something." In other words, it is not the subject which communicates with the help of signifiers with another subject or subjects; on the contrary, the signifier comes to another signifier and establishes the *basic chain* of S1 and S2, through the subject, which it

anticipates. Therefore, Lacan's theory of signifiers is anti-humanist. Lacan is not an anti-humanist because he destroys *human values*, whatever that means, but rather because he changes the communication of the subject from the centre and assumes communication as the event in between, at least two, signifiers S1 and S2. No matter how different the given definitions of signifier are, *they* point out significant structural, materialistic and psycho-analytical specifications of the signifier as a *material relationship*. The demand for a *relationship* which the signifier establishes is the condition of the potential execution of a subject. Lacan's determinants are structural because the signifier is interpreted only in a structural relationship of at least two signifiers (S1 and S2), a relationship which is the beginning of the chaining, which will anticipate every potential sense, meaning, and therefore the subject: "... the ring in the necklace which is the ring in another necklace made up of rings". Definitions of signifiers are materialistic because materialism of the signifier and the materialism of the signifier's relationship super-imposes the *signified* (concept) and the meaning (effect). This is how the materialistic theory of *language* is established, as a system upon which the unconscious is re-instated, and this also means 'subject'. Lacan's theory of subject is a materialistic theory. These theories are psycho-analytical because the signifier is prefigured as idealism within *dramas of sexuality*, i.e. on a symbolic and legislative plan as a concept of *phallus*, in relation with the *Law*. A key consequence of structural, materialistic, and psycho-analytical theory of signifiers is that the structure of language always exists before the subject, in a certain point of mental development steps across its *boundary*, i.e. language is structured in the unconscious, which means that the unconscious is given as a signifier's framework (a chain of signifiers, a web of signifiers) before the subject appeared on the scene. In order for the subject to appear on the scene, a scene has to be set for it, and this scene is the scene of materialistic relationships or the chaining of the signifier. But, the chaining of the signifier is not the work or order of sense itself – the so-called order of Saint Thomas Aquinas, or later on Descartes – this is the place of interruption within the secure/secured meaning and sense with the potential and anticipation that every interruption promises in a dramatic way. But, the signifier materialises the interruption in something which does not exist, which does not yet have a framework. At that, this materialism which the *signifier executes* as a lack, as negative or a 'lost' place, is constitutional for every row/framework and achievement in life. A deficit is distinctive to the signifier as something most distinctive and fated. For example, a signifier's intervention which is called a *stitched point* (*point de capiton*) presupposes an event of bringing in a signifier in a meaningful field and a change of that meaningful field without adding new or other meaning. A *stitched point* is an intervention of the signifier, an instrumental event, and not a consequence of meaning. A signifier is not invented – *it* intervenes and changes the framework of the imagined or produced meaning and sense in the field which it is carried out in. It is not about denotation or connotation of sign or text, that is, a framework of art work, but rather in the *intervention of the signifier*, i.e. the sole signifier without meaning, i.e. a sign which lacks meaning (connotation and denotation). A *lack of meaning* with its intervention changes the view of the observer or listener, that is, the reader, towards the offered framework of meaning and sense in a sign, text or social, political, economic, religious and therefore art work.

Literature: Slavoj Žižek, *Znak Označitelj Pismo - Prilog materijalističkoj teoriji označiteljske prakse* (Mala edicija Ideja, 1976); Ferdinand De Sosir, *Opšta lingvistika* (Nolit, 1977); Rolan Bart, *Književnost mitologija semiologija* (Nolit, 1979); Slavoj Žižek, *Hegel in označevalec* (Analecta, 1980); Žak Lakan, *Spisi (izbor)* (Prosveta, 1983); Radoman Kordić, *Psihoanalitički diskurs* (Naučna knjiga, 1997).

A signifying practice is defined as a process of producing meaning and exhibition in culture, that is, as a process of the production of producing culture as a meaningful framework/world. In cultural studies, the concept 'signifying practice' is derived from the concept of 'signified practice'. These terms are often used as synonyms. However, it is possible to suggest and point out a crucial difference: (1) signifying practice (Fr. *Pratique signifiante*) in the context of late French structuralism and materialism (the magazine *Tel Quel*, Julia Kristeva, Jacques Lacan, Louis Althusser) marks every material shape or way of producing meaning in the field of social resistance and in the field of unconscious activities; (2) signifying practice in the context of British and American cultural studies marks every materialistic shape of representation and advocacy, above all, material effects of representation and advocacy, while 'signified resistances' of social and the unconscious were often understood or suppressed from public use. Understanding a culture, therefore, means explaining how meaning is verbally or sensually-media produced as a 'signifying system'. In this context, Stuart Hall established the following definition of culture: "Under culture here, I mean the actual, basic ground for executing practices, exhibitions, languages and customs of any specific society. I also think of contradictory shapes in a normal sense which is rooted there and which allows the shaping of every-day life."

Literature: Julia Kristeva, *La Révolution du langage poétique* (Seuil, 1974); "Umetnost, družba/tekst" (*Revija Problemi* št. 3-5 (147-149) 1975, str. 1-10); Chris Barker, „Signifying System“ iz *Cultural Studies – Theory and Practice* (Sage, 2000, str. 67-68); David Morley, Kuan-Hsing Chen (eds), *Stuart Hall – Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (Routledge, 2005), Miško Šuvaković, *Diskurzivna analiza* (Univerzitet umetnosti, 2006).

Post-socialism and transition, i.e. the second world in post-Communist Europe, are carried out through the production of every-day *life in repeating* or *finally realised* national states and, therefore, national cultures, every-day things and, definitely, artwork. The post-socialist national state in the 1990's and the first decade of the 21st century looks like an 'unexpected' simulating *monster* of historic copies without real examples in reality. This *monster*, in the neo-liberal world, by means of neo-liberal politics, economics and expansive capitalistically-oriented globalism, establishes local and a very folklorised 'narrative' and an integrated matrix of collective, ethnically identifiable, national, or even racial *selfness*. This comes about collectively, most often, 'hellish' selfness looks like calling and repeating traumatised and forgotten pasts, i.e. 19th century national-bourgeois, meaning dreams of organic and integrated nations: one for one in one. A contemporary transitional state is therefore, often expressed as: (a) above all, a national state of finally-realised and **ospoljenih** changes of blood relations and noble roots in a 'modern' nation; (b) almost stutettering, the global neo-liberal state fits into a world of new imperial assumptions of the EU and USA, and (c) necessarily, the second or third-world state which is paradoxically a national state turned towards the inside and a neo-liberal one on the outside, but this is actually about a hybrid shape of society and family, noble, tycoon and often ex-secret police organisations, which lead towards first-battle accumulation of capital in conditions of controlled and criminalised change-over from social to privatised ownership.

Post-socialist nationalisms show themselves and show **ospoljenih** suppressed, censored, manipulated, cancelled or control-regulated – in the communist era – collective ethnic and national identities. The word is about social and political realisations of one of the *collective identifiable freedoms* which was suppressed in the revolutionary period of real-communism, that is, punished, supervised and often used in social and political struggles in developed and belated bureaucratic real-socialism

through the processes of creating a ‘socialist people’. Collective identification, i.e. national identification, as a political programme and pragmatic biotechnology of executing life is super-imposed to the techniques of shaping ‘individual life’ or *individual freedoms*, i.e. individual human rights as a *collective selfness*. Paradoxically: liberalism is set up in the economy, and the national bourgeois – organised – collectivism in the articulation of public and private social every-day life. The newly-established relationship of collective and individual is given in a contradictory way. Symbolic and imaginary models or organic representations of the concept of ‘nation’ as a freed collective in whose name the ‘appearance’ of individualism is regulated are carried out, in some undefined and arbitrary 19th-century way. This happens – contradictorily – in economic and political macro and micro infrastructures of liberal economic organisations (*capital*) and politics (*vita active*), i.e. shaping the never completely *naked life* of every-day post-socialism. In post-socialism we simultaneously reconstrue vertical bourgeois, national and class structure of the 19th-century West and actual, horizontal, neo-liberal and technocratic production of actual life in belated capitalism at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries. This contradiction is conservative in its own political, i.e. in its sensual prefigured aesthetically-artistic prefiguration. Conservative means that which puts actual ideals of contemporary power struggle and life shaping and retrospectively interprets them as universal or traditional social truths. The concept of prefigured organic development or the continuity of fiction and phantasms of traditions and identities from traditions are offered to the concept of ‘progress’. Moreover, it is brutally concealed that behind this lie, the bio-politics of quick redistribution of social capital, ownership over the means of production/exchange and the establishment of class or caste, within class, centres of social, political, cultural, epistemological and, finally, artistic power. It is as though the ‘national narrative’ hides real reorganisation of ownership in society and the crucial effect of this reorganisation, and this is the recycling of class society characteristic for economic wars of primary accumulation of capital. Instead of the ‘avant-garde’ working class which conducts revolutionary changes, the *capitalistic elite* emerges, which carries out the transition and recycling of capitalism with symptoms of the national-bourgeois society. And one more paradox – although expected – often – very often – the *new capitalistic elite* is made up of ‘former’ people from operative, bureaucratic, technocratic or military-police-political services of the ‘avant-garde working class’, i.e. the communist party. The centralised operative services of the ‘avant-garde working class’ are decentralised and fragmented to local ‘factories’ or ‘bureaus’ or ‘entrepreneurial communities’ with a tendency to join or transfer global capital into local national, bourgeois turn-overs. If one could talk about ‘central supervision’ in the age of communism, nowadays one can talk about these operational services as ‘crazy’ organs without a central or integrative institutional body.

But, what are the characteristics of symbolisation of such a society – a society after socialism? It can be about: skipping, tardiness, return and loss.

Skipping: a seventy-year or forty-year ruling of real-socialism allowed the realisation of a ‘like’ Western (capitalistic, bourgeois, and then, mass-consumer) modernistic project in crucial artistic and civilisational aspects. In a chain of historical events of real-socialist societies there is a lack of Western modernistic, cultural and artistic formations (for example, *high modernism*, and *moderate modernism* is shown as *socialist aesthetism*, which means a drift from the utilitarian revolutionary art as a non-utilitarian and neutral art of techno-bureaucratic post-revolutionary society), that is, in real-socialist societies it did not come to a *transfer* of avant-garde experiments

and excesses in high media culture and educational system. This kind of formulated relationship to modernism and real-socialism can be contradicted by the thesis that modernism of the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's was not a homogenous and consistent formation, but rather a *binary* relationship (tension) between pro-American high modernism based on apparent (proclaimed) artistic autonomy in relation to politics and socialist realism as one utopian type of modernism which was based on proclaimed involvement (connection) towards art and politics in Eastern-block countries. In other words, *real-socialist* art and culture cannot be seen in this type of formation as something outside of modernism or as anti-modernism or as some kind of early post-modernism, but as its constitutive part: a part of the binary pair, as the tension of diverging modernistic realisations.

Tardiness: eastern-European and Balkan countries, with their technological, consumer formations of social relations, cannot reach Western eruptive and ecstatic post-modern consumer and spending relations and this is why they are a rough and undefined '*mimezis of mimezis*' of Western (European, American) post-modernism. But, '*mimezis*' is never a clear reflection, but rather a transfiguration (rearrangement) and transformation (conversion), which is why fragmentary expressions of east-European and Balkan post-modernisms differ from American and European post-modernism. Not only do they differ, but as '*mimezis of mimezis*' they build a totally different optic of presenting and receiving 'reality'. While Western post-modernism is a media multiplication of uncontrolled spending goods and values, east-European, middle-European and Balkan post-modernism is an uncontrolled and unscrupulous expenditure of historically, political conceptions and ideological apparatuses, and thus religious identities. Post-socialism showed a fascinating power that, like a contextual culture, allows the re-shaping and inter-textual pervasion of unconnected political concepts. It showed that politics is not formulated as a recognisable sign or formation of signs in the meta-language field which promises legitimacy of identity, but is rather a *signifier* which is prepared to anticipate or accept any kind of geographical or historically, political assumption in executing ideology. In post-socialism, the concept of post-ideology does not signify a change from ideological to techno-cratic or economic or bureaucratic, that is, micro-political (or everything altogether like in late capitalism), but instead signifies the current or illusory end of one great integrative meta-story (of historical materialism or political projections of revolutionary or bureaucratic communism, etc.) and the power of social ideology to free itself of any kind of story (a step from the sign to the signifier) and that as only one, or as an endless multiplicative signifier, anticipates possible (accessible) meanings according to the axis of geography and the axis of history. Nowadays we have Christian socialism and Stalinism and national socialism in couplings with marginal tactics of the street violence of *skinheads* (in all potential combinations related to fascism or German national-socialism or neo-Naxism) and reformed socialism and social-democracy and autocratic real-socialism and liberal capitalism of primary accumulation of capital and late neo-liberal capitalism, that is national-socialism... Recombinations and recycling of the *sense* are almost incredible in their conflictiveness and contradiction. The power of multiplication is fascinating, it is also depicted as a meta-stage and as an entropical spending of political ideology and as a post-modern pluralism of irreducible differences.

Return: the dominant political tendency within national cultures of post-socialism becomes a critique of communism as an international modernistic culture (which *it* never really was completely) and a critic of belated Western capitalism as a society of spiritual and existential estrangement (which *it* is not completely). The

concepts of return are aimed at pre-modernistic foundations (the project of ontologization or organic origin: root, sources) which becomes a paranoid game with impossible and never-realised national identities as historical projections, utopias and constitutive visions. Romanticist and Classical formations of depicting the 19th century are pre-formulated and recycled as regional or local *dialects* of showing historical, and thus actual realities. The return of the historical being is a return of a fictionally-created organic *body* of a nation and the offered transcending ideals of faith, ethos and aesthetics which lose the Second and eliminate the possibility of the utopian Third.

Loss: post-socialist cultures are entropic cultures. Following the logic of psycho-analytical reading it can be said that post-socialist eastern Europe is a 'remainder' (a waster, excrement, an erased trace): and therefore, the thorough difference between Western and post-socialist post-modernism and approaching globalism should be *emphasised*:

- (a) Western post-modernisms are entropical in the sense of expansive distribution (*dissemination*) of information, values, goods and media exhibits – covering the world, turning various systems of expenditure in different cultural contexts, by increasing the production to multiply expenditure (consumer entropy is a reversible process and multiplies production), while
- (b) post-socialist post-modernisms are entropical in the sense of extensive clearing of space of society and culture – freeing themselves from everything except that which is ontologically necessary as an aspect of national, ethnic and aesthetic self-determination and self-worth, but the *ontological necessity* is just one of the paranoid projections (in the soc-realistic sense of *optimal projection*) of the non-existent historical being (metaphors, allegories, symbols, myths, and legends are inscribed in place of the ontological necessities of modernism and are called the ontological HERE of present reality).

Literature: Marina Gržinić, *Fiction Reconstructed – Eastern Europe, Post-Socialism & the – Retro-Avant-Garde* (Springer, 2000); [Laura Hoptman](#), [Tomasz Pospiszyl](#) (eds), *Primary Documents: A Sourcebook for Eastern and Central European Art Since the 1950s* (The MIT Press, 2002); Aleš Erjavec (ed.), *Postmodernism and the Postsocialist Condition. Politicised Art under Late Socialism* (California University Press, 2003); Irwin (eds), "East Art Map" (*New Moment* no. 20, 2002); Irwin (eds), *East Art Map - Contemporary Art and Eastern Europe* (Afterall Books, 2006).

The First World according to Frederick Jameson, is the world of developed late capitalism, in other words, the First World is a world of plural and eclectic media-determined Western (western Europe, the USA, Japan, Australia) post-modernism. The term 'First World' as a western post-modernism is periodised between 1968 and 1989. During this period, the First World was a world of weakening Cold-War contradictions and tensions, and thus established 'plural relations' which can be described by the slogan: global pluralism also confirms local totalitarianisms.

Western-European post-modernism produces apocalyptic, retro-garde, ecstatic and eroticised post-modern para-historical culture which mimetically presents and realises the *fin de siècle* feeling typical for symbolism and secession at the transition from the 19th to the 20th centuries, by new media (screen showings, electronic media, communication networks) or by *recycling* fictional historical manual and wave procedures in painting (the hand), ballet (the body) and opera (the voice). The portrayed *end of the century* is as though it is simultaneously (paradoxically) the simulation of the return of order (*Rappel a l'ordre, Call to Order*) and fetishism of offense (transgression) from the domain of *civil normality* in the spaces of the obscene and perverse. The end of the century feeling was accumulated as a *stochastic* system of hedonistic, decadent, eroticised, perverted and neo-conservative discursive

and media pictures which show how the power of the lord (productive, class, racial, political, intellectual, artistic) became a great allegory of the creation of the Second (being at the same time a provincial and cosmopolitan, a puritan and a participant in erotic body-language, picturesque games, apolitical subjectiveness and an ideological bureaucratic mechanism of power production or subversion of power – subversion and apology of power are in a post-modern sense in a seductive embrace of paradox, cries, horror and perverse pleasures). Western-European post-modernism is *Euro-centric* in the sense that European history fetishes and centres itself as the dominant formation of codes, and therefore, as a meta-code, of not only European *historical fictional and narrative formations*, but also of every other (geographical or historical) possible narrative formation and legitimacy of its constitution. The elitist concept of *tradition* as a crossing of antique and Judeo-Christian civilisation becomes the *universal code* of naming (identification) of any identity. The point of European tradition as a totalising law (Hegel, Marx) or as a fragmented trace (Roland Barthes, Jacques Lacan, Jacques Derrida, Jean-Francois Lyottard) is enjoyed as the only *source* (Heidegger) possible at the end of the 20th century. But, whether it was *Europe* at the very beginning – let us look at a suspicious identification, which is pointed out by Edgar Moren: “That which is called Europe at the beginning, is not Europe at all. The Greeks are those who in the 7th century B.C. call that which to them is the unknown continental north... the Greeks obviously turned their backs to the continent and only called upon the Mediterranean Sea which will become the life and trade seat of the Roman Empire... Europe is a shapeless northern **onostranost** of the ancient world” (*Thinking Europe*). Jan Patocka, on the *erased trace* of Husserl’s *crisis of European science*, and in the more distant trace of Oswald Arnold Gottfried Spengler (1880-1936), a trace with which one could not completely accept to be identified with, writes: “Husserl’s work, which was written to prevent the final catastrophe of the European world, can still be used to clarify the situation of mankind after the catastrophe, as well as to light part of the way in the post-European world. In order for us to achieve maximal clarity, we have to make a difference between European principles (principles of rational reflexes whose every work and opinion assumes finding out) and Europe as a unique political, social and spiritual reality (in its preparation, in its individual factual-historic institutions and in their power which even after the collapse of sovereign individual organisms works in the direction of unity) and European heritage (of course, heritage consists of that which all inheritants take from Europe, what they proclaim to be obvious for the greater good: in science, technology, rational organisation of agriculture and society). Just that take-over of heritage allowed the inheritants to be what they are. The end of Europe as a historical, state creation which was rising above the rest of the world and which unsuccessfully tried to reign the entire world, is connected to the generalisation of European heritage (*Europe and the post-European era*). History becomes a possession (that which one has as an object or what is coded and re-coded as an information or presentation) and with this, really becomes the past (an archive, memory, a stored code). The end of the 19th century in this sense of expectation, centres on the seat of every **mimēzīs** and of every removal of **mimēzīs** by which showing the object of the wish becomes an *exhibition of the exhibited (mimēzisa mimēzisa)* symbolic epitomisation of wishes from 19th-century social (linguistic, visual, musical, behavioural, philosophical, productive, erotic) games and relocations (transfiguration). The wish for living the ending is a *fictional game* of historic presentations and their *reflections* of a non-existent former unity or future apocalyptic goal. History and tradition are instrumental codes in presenting (suggesting) the atmosphere of ending. The fictionalisation of the

source or the *depth* of Europe in place of *practical ideology* or *direct* and *textual art* becomes and remains one of the characteristic thematisations and aesthetisations of European discourse at the end of the century (*fin de siècle*).

American (explicitly and ecstatically formulated as Californian or L.A.) post-modernism and Japanese post-modernism (Tokyo) are established on the verge of urban and virtual space (like *cyber-space* – a space of mechanical and digital produced relations). Virtual space is an ahistorical digital world of technological TU present (Tu-bio = *da-gewesen*), and an always actualised, reality. Architecture is an unstable space of changing pictures (abstract and exhibited) in which every-day existence of production, exchange, expenditure of information, values, beliefs, wishes, and in a phenomenological sense: space and time is imagined. Television, computer, video and film *icons* of trans-historic (through different geographically-located histories) and trans-national (crossing from the possible world of identity into the possible world of differences) accumulate emotions of presence of different cultures in one factional (imagined and multiplying) moment (multi-culturalism). The post-modernism of L.A. leads a fractional megalopolis writing in every fraction of art, race, sex, spectacle, ecstasy and monotony of every-day metaphoric and allegorical criteriums of synchronised linguistic games of race, sex, economy and aesthetics. Epistemological borders between aesthetics and economy are lost. Appearance or literality? Japanese post-modernism almost narcotically creates atmospheres in which one can hear: the *voices of reflection of the end of European meta-physics* (for example, Heidegger is multi-present in Japanese philosophy and cultural theory as the border code which separates or faces the ontological source and the informative-semiological recipient). Modernism introduced the criteria of functionality as aesthetic criteria, while architectural post-modernism of L.A. and Japan carries out techno-aesthetisation of every-day functionality. This is about dramatic and ecstatic inversion, a dull reflection and asymmetry of form. Aesthetics as the criteria of urbanism. Flux urbanism instead of construction static of accurate structures of modernism. The product disappears and is replaced by flux (movement, spray, tendency, action, exchange, rearrangement). The aesthetic becomes an aspect of the functional, that is, functional without aesthetic is not sufficiently functional. The impossibility that some urban, dressed, culinary, watching or sexual be functional without aesthetic, makes *aesthetic* be *equivalent* (or as an equivalent) to *ontological*, for the first time in history. The machine works on its own without a subject. The machine is dead and obscenely *beautiful*. It is the relationship towards beauty, *the dirty beauty of pleasure*, but also towards the *sublime beauty of transcendence*. It is as if it shows that between *dirty beauty* and *sublime beauty* there is no substantial difference, that is, that one shapeless (**informe** = shapeless, formless) *ontology* precedes the dirty and the sublime. And that is why all depth of tradition, but also of the modern, is *projected* as a surface of a de-materialised town: “If the time space becomes thin – ‘infra-thin’ – while it is drastically being ‘sewn’, things are, until then – visible objects – and also thin out and lose their strength and density” (Paul Virilio, “Perspectives of Old Time”).

Literature: Achile Bonito Oliva, *Transavantgarde International* (Giancarlo Politi Editore, 1982); Hal Foster (ed), *Postmodern culture* (Pluto Press, 1983); Žan-Fransoa Liotar, *Postmoderno stanje* (Bratsvo-jedinstvo, 1988); Žan Bodrijar, *Fatalne strategije*, (Književna zajednica Novog Sada, 1991); Frederic Jameson, *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Verso, 1992); Frederic Jameson, *The Geopolitical Aesthetics. Cinema and Space in the World System* (Indiana University Press, 1995); Pol Virilio, *Kritični prostor* (UD Gradac, 1997);

Radical democracy is a theoretical and political platform which was developed by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe in the book *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*

towards *Radical Democracy in Politics* (1985). They established the theory of radical democracy as the basis of the platform for developing new emancipatory-oriented political philosophies. Their critical analysis is derived from an analysis of the crisis of left-wing political and social options in an era of neo-liberal and neo-conservative domination in the concepts of democracy. Liberal theory of democracy, based on the concept of freedom and equality, was offered a concept of difference which leads to the sole, crucial specification of democracy. Eliminating the 'differences' from liberal concepts of democracy established on the strategy of 'consensus' led to a repression and cancellation of differences in thought, race, class, sex and **svetonazorima**. An important character of radical democracy is found in the resistances which different events of difference in society give to the consensus. A resistance of the consensus in society is, actually, a demand for executing social autonomies within society, which are not in accordance with society as a whole. This is about the theoretical politicisation of the concept of post-modern pluralism. Pluralism does not mean the accordance of contradictions but the admittance of contradictions with all autonomies which spring from it. According to Laclau, this means that there is no 'truth' or 'value' which is independent from context. But the context is not independent from other concepts and interactions with it. This dynamic concept of plurality marks the platform by which particularity can be totally realised, only if it stays permanently open, always in redefining its relations towards the universal, in a philosophical sense. Radical democracy in society, therefore, is not just an acceptance of differences, variations and contradictions, but instead a dynamically, interactive development of possibility for its inclusion in democratic platforms. Differences, conflicts and contradictions are shown as necessities which have to appear noticeable and predictable in social practices. The building of democracy on differences and variations make it so that repressive and oppressive power relations are accessible and susceptible to retrogression. The theoreticians Paulo Freire (1921-1997), Belle Hooks, that is, Gloria Jean Watkins (1952), Henry Giroux (1943), Paul Chatterton and Richard J. F. Day (1964) have all dealt with concepts of radical democracy. The theory of radical democracy is associated with the movements of social autonomy in South America (the *Zapatistas* in Mexico, the *Non-Global Workers' Movement* or the *Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra – MST* in Brazil and *Puetero – the Unemployed Workers's Movement* in Argentina). Philosophy, theory and practice of 'radical democracy' offer a discourse on the concept of emancipatory democratic theoretical practice to contemporary globalism and anti-globalism, i.e. the expansive liberal and violent left-wing.

Literature: Ernesto Laclau, Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (Verso, 1985); David Trend (ed) *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship, and the State* (Routledge, 1995); Seyla Benhabib (ed) *Democracy and Difference - Contesting Boundaries of the Political* (Princeton University Press, 1996); Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Continuum, 2004); Chantal Mouffe, *The Return of Political* (Verso, 2005); Ernesto Laclau, *Emancipation(s)* (Verso, 2007).

Cyberspace is the concept which was suggested by the author William Gibson in the novel *Neuromancer* (1984), one of the key achievements of cyberpunk (*cyberpunk literature*). According to him, cyberspace is virtually an abstract surrounding, in which economic information can be visualised as geometric structures. The term describes a space generated in computer programmes. Cyberspace is defined as a three-dimensional region in which cybernetic returning connections (*feedback*) and control develop. Cyberspace is also the name given to virtual reality, VR (*Virtual*

Reality) or artificial reality. The concept of cyberspace is established through feedback between the user's sensor system and the cyberspace of using interactions in real time between physical and virtual bodies. In a phenomenological and meta-physical sense, cyberspace faces: (1) *being* and *non-being* (a biological organism and machine system), (2) *physical space* (TU presence) and *screen simulational space* (the time of physical and biological processes) and *machine time* (the time of electronic and symbolic reduction). In cyberspace, there comes to a relativising of relations of independence and non-independence of man and the machine. The autonomy of the biological organism is destroyed (an organically-closed whole). Physical space, which in eclectic post-modernism had all of the functions of *mimesis mimesis* of text, now becomes a relative space of changing *crossings, regulations and de-regulations* of possibility. Cyberspace is a *nomadic space* in the sense in which the final morphological (ontological) identification of identity does not exist (figure and body, screen and world, software and spirit). Identity is a *greatness* which is regulated and brings back *positive* or *negative feedback* into the system, rather than a *sourceful* (essential) fact which starts the fundamental phenomenological ontology of the system. Virtual space is often marked as immaterial space with individual writers and theoreticians, because of the overlapping of physical and symbolic – real and virtual. This thesis is untrue because cyberspace is a substantial singularity, or achieved totality of singularity, which is the materialistic societal practice of producing 'phenomenons' or 'events' of communication. Cyberspace is also a part of global politics and production, that is, re-programmed hybrid shapes of 'life' on a planetary level. To see, for example, the relation between cyberspace and the internet in organising and shaping productive situations and events of cyber-life in the contemporary globalisation of 'representation'.

Literature: William Gibson, *Neuromancer*, Ace, New York, 1984; Donna J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women - The Reinvention of Nature* (Routledge, 1991); Verena Andermatt Conley (ed), *Rethinking Technologies* (University of Minnesota Press, 1993); Stanley Aronowitz i dr. (eds), *Technoscience and Cyberculture* (Routledge, 1996); Rosi Braidotti, Nina Lykke (eds), *Between Monsters Goddesses and Cyborgs – Feminist Confrontations with Science, Medicine and Cyberspace* (ZED Books, 1996); Brian Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation (Post-Contemporary Interventions)* (Duke University Press, 2002); Mark B.N. Hansen, *New Philosophy for New Media* (The MIT Press, 2004).

Singularity (*singularis*) is that which is individual or belonging to only one existing object, situation, event or creature in a traditional philosophical sense. A big turnover in western thought took place during the Renaissance when the concept of the world, defined by the horizons of the Mediterranean, Europe or Eurasia, was faced with the discovery of the new worlds. In one moment, the world became a world of multitude of islands and continents, and this means an endless number of singularity. In the primary sense, 'singularity' is seen as an opposition to *totality*.

In a contemporary sense, according to the French philosopher Gilles Deleuze, singularity happens in 'open totality' and philosophy is a trip to endless trajectories of the 'lines of flight' which leads to all parts of the world, but above all, between the conceptual islands and points of singularity. For the concept of singularity, the concept of event is important, because singularity is a place where an individual perception is taken into action. The perception of a singularity event is foreseen as an entangled finality of 'one' and a potential entanglement of 'one' multitude of open totalities. Deleuze asked himself what an ideal event was in one place of *Logic of Sense*. According to him, an ideal event is a singularity, or more of a gathering of singularities or single points, which characterise a mathematical error, the physical state of things, psychology and opinions of the individual. Singularities are points of

turnover and points of conjugation: the neck of a bottle, knots, lobbies, centres, points of connection, condensation and boiling, and thus points of tears and pleasure, sickness and health, hope and depression, these are actually the points of 'feeling'. Singularities are also zones of pure expression, that is, singularities are domains, registers, regions, departments or even topographical units. Singularity is therefore something which is philosophically set up as 'one' and this *one* is understood as complex in its multitude which is never given/set up in a simple way in the world, because the 'event' of setting up is itself complex and an imminence against 'transcendancy'. From the above said, a conceptual difference between 'particularity' and 'singularity' is carried out: particularity is individuality without the possibility of realisation and indication of complexity. Singularity is individuality which is paradoxically and simultaneously complex and unrepeatable within the event.

Literature: Žil Delez, Feliks Gatari, *Šta je filozofija?* (IK Zorana Stojanovića, 1995); Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense* (Continuum, 2004); Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition* (Continuum, 2005); Tom Conley, „Singularity“, iz Adrian Parr (ed), *The Deleuze Dictionary* (Columbia University Press, 2005, str. 251-253).

Cultural studies are an academic platform for researching, interpreting, and discussion of culture. The concept was established by Richard Hoggarth in 1964. Cultural studies are – unlike historical science or theory of culture such as anthropology, ethnology, literary studies, art studies, sociology, sociological culture or culturology – an interdisciplinary hybrid research of 'culture' based on the models of: (a) studies based on the analysis of cultural production, in other words, cultural processes in every-day life are researched; (b) studies based on the analysis of textual products, in other words, the results or effects of cultural processes which are prefigured by text models are researched, and (c) studies of live, actual, culture, in other words, formations, contexts and institutions which participate in organising and articulating every-day life in the contemporary world are researched.

Cultural studies appeared in Britain during the 1950's with the development of the teachings of the literary theoretician, Frank Raymond Leavis. Leavis started from modernistic, post-elitist, research of culture and studying inter-relations between high (ideal) and popular (every-day) culture. He showed that every-day culture is not just a *holiday culture (leisure activity)*, but rather a way of constituting life in relation to public and private boundaries in the way of living. The modernistic horizon of Leavis' thought has been tried and developed in a new way, by drama and culture theoretician Raymond Williams and sociologist Richard Hoggarth. Hoggarth established the *Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies – CCCS* or the *Birmingham School* in 1964. CCCS was a graduate research institute established in the English language department. The directors of the Centre were Hoggarth, Stuart Hall and Richard Johnson. Hoggarth theoretically interpreted traditional cultural change of the British working class (*culture of the people*) in contemporary mass media culture.

Cultural studies are not a developed and integrative science or a philosophy of culture, but rather a multitude of positions, i.e. *clusters* set up on a mutual 'platform' of researching culture and applying knowledge and convictions executed from the 20th-century language turnover on the analysis of cultural 'texts'. Unlike sociology of culture, which relates to 'cultural appearances', cultural studies are about the analysis of *cultural texts*, i.e. the meaning of cultural practices. Cultural studies are not oriented around the 'universality' of philosophy, but rather towards individual activism or identifying the life interval in actuality which is conditioned by the influences and effects of *social powers*. Hegemony is a way in which a dominant social group in society, by means of intellectual and moral leadership, leans towards

victory and *subordinates* other groups in society. In cultural theory, the concept of *hegemony* is set up as a model of depicting the relation of dominant and subordinate cultures or cultural formations, or even, prefigured examples. The hegemony of one model over another, is a shape of an instrumental articulation of social, cultural and even artistic *field of power* within actuality. The concept of hegemony was established by Italian philosopher Antonio Gramsci, and the actual application of the concept was carried out by theoreticians of cultural studies from Raymond Williams to Tony Bennett. Hegemony marks the relationship between culture and power, which for Gramsci was class-determined and which was 'biased, because it was being established as an influence, domination, presence, or even, a superimposition within culture or between cultures. Hegemony can be observed on influences and dominations of the 'aesthetic' or 'artistic fashions' within one societal class or between different cultures, societies or civilisations. For example, theories of hegemony show how one 'taste' is established and how it influences general public opinion or how the 'taste' from one culture is transferred to other cultures. Moreover, hegemony is also seen on examples of 'art work', 'art style', or 'art appearance'. According to Bennett, cultural studies can be interpreted by a line of 'individual definitions' in which portrayed relations of culture and power are established. Cultural studies deal with practices, institutions and systems of classification which are implanted into the population as values, beliefs, competencies, life routines and usual forms of control. The shapes of power which cultural studies research are different, and they engulf sex, class, colonialism, etc. In cultural studies, relations between shapes of power, that is, ways of thinking about culture and power are developed, and thus models which can be applied to interpretations of power and culture are expressed. The usual institutional places for performing cultural studies are those which belong to higher education and that is why cultural studies are similar to other academic disciplines. However, they try to establish a connection with social and political movements, workers in cultural institutions and cultural management outside of academic life.

Literature: Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford University Press, 1977); Dave Morley, Kuan-Hsing Chen (eds), *Stuart Hall* (Routledge, 1996); Tony Bennett, *Culture: A Reformer's Science* (Allen & Unwin, 1998); John Storey (ed), *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: A Reader* (Hemel Hempstead, Princeton Hall, 1998); Elaine Baldwin, Brian Longhurst, Greg Smith, Scott McCracken, Miles Osborn (eds), *Introducing Cultural Studies* (University of Georgia Press, 2000); Chris Barker, *Cultural Studies – Theory and Practice* (Sage Publications, London, 2000); Mark Gibson, *Culture and Power – A History of Cultural Studies* (Berg, 2007).

Sovereignty is one of the thorough concepts of political theory about who has rights and who can rule. Negri and Hardt show that the whole tradition of political theory really fits with the idea that only 'one' can rule, be it that that person is thought of as a monarch, state, nation, people or party. The concept of sovereignty shows that it is this 'one' who must rule, who is the one guarantee of social formation – in other words, a dilemma is posed: either sovereignty or anarchy! Carl Schmitt (1888-1985) was a German publicist and political theoretician who centred the theory of sovereignty as a thorough problem of European political theory. Theories of modern sovereignty in politics fit into capitalistic theories of economic management: there has to be one unitary character who accepts responsibility and decides in the domain of production. Giorgio Agamben established a paradox of sovereignty which goes: "sovereignty is simultaneously outwith and within legal formation". In other words, the role of the sovereign – whoever it may be and in whatever given hour of the historical West – is that it is accepted from the legal system as something outwith the legal system so that it could be – metaphorically speaking – said "I, the sovereign,

who am above the law, proclaim that nothing is outwith the law". This is why the question of the sovereign and sovereignty, is really, a question about the way in which to structure power in public and in secret, that is, in historical and fictionally meta-physical sociality.

In a critical discussion about 'sovereignty', Negri and Hardt start from the thesis that sovereignty was never an *autonomous substance* and is never *absolute*, but that it is composed of relations between the ruler and those who are being ruled, thus between protection and subversion, between law and obligation. In this context, the power of the sovereign is not only in the ruling of death, but also in the production of social life. Pointing to the contemporary moment of globalism, it can be said that economic production is more and more bio-political. It is not only directed towards the production of goods, but in the end line of production: information, communication and inter-human cooperation in the widest sense. It can be said that the economic production, which is today becoming more of a bio-political production, is directed towards the production of social relations and social formations. That is why, culture for example, is a direct element of political formation and economic production. A global formation of power, today, is shown as a compact and multi-sign process of convergence of different shapes of power, war, politics, economy and culture in social-life practices as a whole, and thus of bio-power. In contemporary globalism, capital and sovereignty lean towards complete over-lapping. The alternative to 'sovereignty' is in establishing 'multitude' in the situation to create social relations, and by this it is set up against both anarchy and sovereignty. A new possibility for politics is moving away from the function and effect of sovereignty towards functions and effects of a multitude of work in shaping life in reality.

Establishing a model/machine of state sovereignty or a sovereignty of national states is shown as a consequence of European structure building and mechanisms of state power, according to Hannah Arendt, Negri and Hardt. Structures and mechanisms of state power should have controlled state crises. The concept of national sovereignty was established from the end of the 18th and during the 19th centuries: "At the base of this definitive shape of concept were trauma, the French Revolution, and solving this trauma, a reactionary adoption and strengthening of the concept of nation" (Hardt, Negri, *Empire*). The concept of national state led to the shaping of modern social and state identities in a democratic and in a totalitarian sense. The processes of economic, productive, informative and social globalisation, and thus establishing supra- or multi-national neo-liberal state clean-ups (EU) or imperial conceptions of world order (USA) led to the external crisis in relation to national sovereignties which were already shaken up by internal conflicts during the 1990's and the beginning of the 21st century. On the other hand, the homogeneities of national sovereignties, as well as imperial hegemonies, confront the critical and projective conception of multitude (Negri, Hardt, Agamben, Virno). This radical globalism of multitude is pointed out in the slogan: "Global citizenship is the power of the multitude to once again acquire supervision over space and thus draw a new cartography" (Negri, Hardt, *Empire*).

Literature: Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, *Imperij* (Multimedijalni institut i Arkzin, 2003); Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, „Multitude – War and Democracy in The Age of Empire“ (Penguin Books, 2004); Carl Schmitt, *Legality and Legitimacy* (Duke University Press, 2004); Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, „Politika mnoštva“ (Tvrđa br. 1-2, 2005, str. 70-93); *Homo sacer – Suverena moć i goli život* (Multimedijalni institut, 2006).

Terrorism in a contemporary sense, is identified as executing individual or collective extra-institutional, and most oftenly, politically-violent actions against civilians in peaceful circumstances. Terrorism can be differentiated by local and global terrorism.

Local terrorism marks the carrying out of violent actions against the peaceful population in a specific crisis state or regional territory. Global terrorism is a contemporary concept and relates to terrorist actions carried out anywhere on the planet or to terrorist actions carried out at different places on the planet but mutually connected by political concepts or organisational infrastructures. Voluntary or 'subjective' terrorism marks individual terrorist actions which work independently from political groups, parties, movements, para-institutions or institutions. Voluntary terrorism is most often emotionally-coloured by an individual's reaction against a collective which threatens it symbolically or existentially in any sense. Populist or national terrorism is that shape of individual or group terrorist actions which emerges from ethnic, national, racial, religious or class mass movements which do not have a centralised political organisation.

The concept 'terrorism' should be differentiated from the concept of 'terror'. Terrorism is above all, characteristic for extra-institutional or secret-institutional shapes of carrying out violence in society. Terror is characteristic for institutional, i.e. state shapes of violence towards the population in that state or towards the population in another state. Revolutionary terror (the terror in France, Bolshevik-Soviet, Yugoslav, Chinese or Cambodian revolution) is the name given to the execution of political violence in a revolutionary change of the societal system or during the establishment, i.e. the institutionalisation of a new, political system, that is, a leadership within that system. Revolutionary terror can be carried out by individuals, groups, parties, the political elite within the framework of the state and state institutions. The concept of terrorism is carried out from the concept 'regime of terror' which happened at the time of the French Revolution in 1789. Terrorism is characteristic for all different kinds of politics from the left-wing (class-based) to right-wing (racial, ethnic, nationalistic, class-based) to religious platforms.

The historical link between anarchism and terrorism in the 19th and early 20th centuries is characteristic. Violent anarchism is a kind of antecedent to terrorism. Unlike contemporary terrorism at the crossing from the 20th to 21st centuries, which was primarily aimed towards carrying out violence over coincidentally-found or chosen populations, anarchic terrorism of the 19th century was aimed towards the liquidation of political and economic leaders or distinguished individuals in some society. Anarchic terrorism was led by political concepts which confronted the state and state repressions from its conception, while contemporary terrorism, is very often, the legitimate or illegitimate state representative in a crisis or a political group which wishes to establish a state or take control of the state, that is, 'punish' the state or the state sub-structure, which it considers the guilty party for the occupation, colonisation, economic exploitation, violent globalisation, or forced ethnic, national, or religious identities. Left-wing terrorism of the late 1960's and 1970's, most notably in Italy and Germany, was led by *ideas* of starting up the workers revolution (Italy – the conception of the *Red Brigade* movement or *Brigate Rosse*) or executing pre-revolutionary terror and the achievements of social chaos in capitalistic society which should prepare the conditions for revolution (Germany – a group of *Red Army Factions* or RAF, i.e. *Rote Armee Fraktion*). Right-wing terrorism of different individuals or social micro-groups (skinheads, neo-Nazis, neo-Fascists, radical nationalists, religious fundamentalists) is established on conservative, neo-conservative and meta-physically supported discourses of struggles for traditional values, patriarchal heterosexual morals, a strong state, a homogenous and politically-dominated religion, etc.

The concept 'state terrorism' is often considered a contradiction, because the concept of terrorism is enlarged with extra-institutional and non-state political violence. This means that state violence, aimed at the civilian population, is seen as 'war violence' or as 'state terror' or 'state repression'. It can be said, contrary to this opinion, that 'state terrorism' marks all those secret policies and secret violent executions of state power using extra-institutional or para-institutional organisations which are under complete or semi-state control.

In a philosophical-political sense, the basic question about terrorism is the question of the 'legitimacy of using or carrying out violence'. The question of violence legitimacy is a question about the right to violence and conditions under which violence is carried out. Opinions which see the 'legitimacy of violence' in a class jeopardy and class power to articulate themselves into a legitimate carrier of revolutionary resistance or attack, differ. Left-wing and right-wing terrorist or revolutionary calls for 'legitimising violence' can be found in a class, economic, racial, ethnic, national, religious, sexual or generational jeopardy within a society or state. For example, in his political theory, Antonio Negri set out a thesis that only armed conflict speaks about communism in Italy during that time (1973). He established this thesis on the 'revolutionary subject' thesis which he defined as the synthesis of mass power in the 'avant-garde' which will lead towards the articulation of armed struggle. In this sense, terrorism is the name given to actions which did not ensue from the indicated articulation of the mass, but rather from volunteerism and populism. Contrary to interpretations which represent or justify the 'legitimacy of violence', there are radical democratic positions by which it is proposed that every violence is illegitimate and subject to critical analysis which leads to the prefiguration of *power structures* which lie behind it. In other words, it does not go to show that terrorist violence will not exist anymore, but rather that violence even though necessary, is not legitimate, irrespective of the results which it tends towards. By this, it is shown that 'every violence' has to go through an analysis of its illegitimacy irrespective of the fact that maybe extra-institutional 'terrorism', state terror or state-institutional repression lies behind it. From critical standpoints, and this is shown as one of the characteristic 'facts' of modern and post-modern terrorism, the relationship between extra-institutional and institutional violence, i.e. terrorism and the state, is not an obvious and binary opposition of contradictions, but is more of a coherent intricacy of intra-dependent circumstances, relations, relationships and intra-actions which need to be dismembered on a case by case basis. The paradox of 'legitimate violence' has to be interpreted precisely by the theses about a 'just war' or 'just terror'. This is why ideas of state legitimacy in carrying out violence and revolutionary legitimacy of terrorism and the demand for 'weapons' which have to be found for a modern democracy and which will lead it – not towards acquiring power and commanding armies – but instead for destroying the sole possibility of their existence, and this means posing questions about the character of every violence, and even that violence which is carried out by the public political domain of democracy, is contradicted.

Literature: [Hans Köchler](#) (ed), *Terrorism and National Liberation. Proceedings of the International Conference on the Question of Terrorism* (Peter Lang, 1988); United Nations: [Conventions on Terrorism](#) (<http://untreaty.un.org/English/Terrorism.asp>); Yonah Alexander, Dennis A. Pluchinsky, *Europe's Red Terrorists: The Fighting Communist Organizations* (Routledge, 1992); Slavoj Žižek, *Welcome to the Desert of the Real: Five Essays on September 11 and Related Dates* (Verso, 2002); Pavle Kalinić, *RAF – Frakcija crvene armije 1970-1998* (Profil international, 2002); Pavle Kalinić, *Teror i terorizam* (Jesenski i Turk, 2003); Negri on Negri – Antonio Negri in conversation with Anne Dufourmantelle (Routledge, 2004); [Timothy Murphy, Abdul-Karim Mustapha](#) (eds), *The Philosophy of Antonio Negri: Resistance in Practice* (Pluto Press, 2005); Michel Hardt, Antonio Negri, „Politika mnoštva“ (Tvrđa br. 1-2, 2005, str. 70-93).

The third world is the name for under-developed, most commonly, colonial, neo-colonial or post-colonial societies, states or cultures in Africa, Asia, South America and Oceania. The term was established by the French demographer Alfred Sauvy in 1952, in order for him to mark the contrast and tension between the economically-developed and under-developed world. During the Cold War the 'third world' concept included economically under-developed countries which did not take part in the binary, planetary division of power between the Soviet and American blocks. Today, by third world, we mean post-colonial societies or economically under-developed societies outside of the 'western' context of civilisation, symbolically marked by the stigma *Global South*.

Hannah Arendt placed a crucial, critical remark of the identification of the 'third world' pointing out that the 'third world' was not a realistic geographical or social position, but an ideological effect. Theoreticians such as Andre Gunder Frank and Walther Rodney use the term 'under-developed' or 'non-developed world' to take away attention from geographically locating the 'third world' with the *global south* in the domain of economic, political identifications and development potentials. In post-colonial studies, in other words, concepts of the 'third world' as a closed 'global south' are shown as effects with imperial weight and imperial politics of developed states.

Literature: [Christopher Clapham](#), *Third World Politics: An Introduction* (University of Wisconsin Press, 1985); Ray Kiely, *Globalisation and the Third World* (Routledge, 1998); Amritjit Singh, [Edward W. Said](#), *Interviews With Edward W. Said* (University Press of Mississippi, 2004).

The third world in the first world is a cynical, although in certain circumstances, an epistemological observation of a certain number of political and cultural analysts so that the third world, like the second world of racial and ethnic communities, is not only found in the 'global south' but also in centres (*down towns*) or peripheries (*suburbs*) of large cities (Paris, London, Berlin, New York, Los Angeles) in developed western countries. The existence of the 'third world' in the middle of the first world is one of the key political, social, and cultural contradictions of the post-modern and globalist multi-culturalism of the 1990's and first years of the 21st century. This means confronting culturally deteriorated and re-territorialised different racial, ethnic and religious cultures of the first and second world in the same urban space of large western cities.

Literature: [Elsbeth Young](#), *The Third World in the First: Development and Indigenous Peoples* (Routledge, 1995); [Deepak Narang Sawhney](#) (Ed), *Unmasking L.A.: Third Worlds & the City*, (Palgrave MacMillan, 2002).

Art in the age of culture is an undetermined index identification for art after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the turnover from *special symptomatic retro practices* in art from the 1980's and early 1990's towards determining art of the new global era. New art in the age of culture is in existence from centred autonomies within macro-political formations in art with clear and indicative cultural functions within the new media reconfiguration and **resemantizacije** of reality. Art in the age of culture begins with the carrying out of global empires from the United States to the EU (European Union) in the post-block era. Something significant changed in art and in culture after the fall of the Berlin Wall and this change should be identified.

The history of transfiguration from autonomous art to art in the age of culture have global and local histories which can be shown by the characteristic *stitched points (point de captation)*! For example, John Cage wrote down these anticipations in his daily remarks from the middle of the 1960's: "In order for us to know whether or

not art is contemporary, we do not use aesthetic criteria (...) we use social criteria". Cage pointed out an unpredictable drift from modern essential art autonomy towards anarchic effects of representing culture as 'substances' of art. The turnover was completely expected and possible after Marcel Duchamps, Georges Bataille, Walter Benjamin, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Jacques Lacan and Cage himself. Art became the object, situation or event from 'culture' in the move from a 'possible world' to the 'possible world'. Two decades later, after Cage's anticipations, promoting post-modern conditions (*condition post-moderne*), Victor Burgin wrote about the end of art theory: "If *art theory* is understood as an independent shape of art history, aesthetics and critics, which was started with the Enlightenment and culminated with high modernism, now it is in its own area. The reality which we call the post-modern age next to art theory, coincides with the appearance of general theory of presentation: critical understanding of the shape and means of symbolic articulation of our critical social and subjectivity shapes." At approximately the same time, in the mid-1980's, David Carroll, one of the not-completely compatible followers of Jacques Derrida's teachings, tried to name the situation of border relations of theory, art, literature, philosophy and culture with the term 'paraesthetic' (*paraesthetic*). Paraesthetics points out the fascination of borders with possible worlds. In other words, 'paraesthetics' do not have a goal to solve the questions of art, theory and culture 'borders', but rather to enter the game of moving, representation, convergence and postponing possible inscriptions of discursive identities of art, theory and culture. This means events which are inscribed into the process or the behaviour which is inscribed in the wider discursive creation: "The task of paraesthetic theory is not to solve all questions which relate to the relation of theory, art and literature, but instead to think over these relations and use transformation and moving art and literature to react to philosophical, historical and political 'fields' – 'fields' by which art and literature are inseparably connected." Carroll's concept of 'paraesthetics' as a theory of border syndrome of theories, art and culture is some kind of pre-textual promise which is realised in contemporary art. At the end of the 1980's, in a completely determined moment of European history, a reconstituting of art functions took place. Art once again became a 'culture thing' with specific intervening functions. This time between western (liberal or social-democratic) European integration societies and post-political (pre-transitional, transitional or 'fit-in') fragmented and divided east-European societies. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, art became political once again, or maybe anthropological, but that, according to its own thematism, is not necessarily political, ideological and presentational. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, European art does not 'reflect' a social content through thematics, but *immediately*, in the organisation of precisely the market's economy, whose secondary efficiency is thematics. By this, art is not shown as some kind of 'pre-human chaos', an undetermined gulf of nature, but rather as a determined social practice, and this means a *signified practice* within obvious social demands, expectations and acts. In other words, the movement of European and American art from the 'autonomy of modernism' and 'disinterest of eclectic post-modernism' towards gaining social functions, above all, functions of culture, interventions between 'possible worlds' (the centre, margins, transitional formations, non-transitional formations) had an influence on precisely art, and this means the possibilities of its material formulations. Formulations of painting and sculpture are replaced by formulations of open informative parts which is the erased trace of culture on a specific place (*site-specific place*) or is an 'inscription' of layered traces of culture 'from' some specific place. That is why the ontology of these 'contemporary' works is not aesthetic but social: it

is 'from' culture. Ontology is not a presence of form, but a resistance (entropy) of form in carrying out events.

For contemporary culture, short attachments or corridors between *art* and *culture* are characteristic. There are movements by which art is changed into culture (production, multiplication, exchange, expenditure, usage, adaptation, but also the enjoyment of 'appearance' or 'sense' of art as an every-day artifact) and by which culture is incorporated into art (citations, collages, montages, paraphrases, simulations, *mimezis mimezisa*, usage, *ready made*, transfiguration, transformation, inter-textuality). Between theory of art and theory of culture, today, (it is as though) there exist clear (you can see through them) and permeable (transmitting over or through) borders. Art as a cultural practice is played through permeability of relations of contemporary mega-cultures after the fall of the Berlin Wall and *macro-ideological practices and cultural systems* (western Europe, North America, post-socialist countries and the Third World; i.e. cultural relations between the first, second and third worlds). Different *index works* can be separated which inform of concrete or potential reality. A 'situation' of art is established in an *era of confusion*: art today, i.e. on the crossing from the 20th to the 21st centuries, the century is art outside of distinguishable contextualisations of direction, styles, manners, movements, tendencies – it is an art of chaotic and sped-up unclarity of art concepts in an open field of new media... Nan Golding photographically documents his every-day life, for example, she films a self-portrait after her *boyfriend* beat her up and hurt her (*Nan, one month after she was beaten up*, 1984). Rawi Agarwal photographs every-day urban life of the *third world* (*Hindu Procession*, 1993). Rene Cox labels, and often, allegorizes every-day family life (life couples, motherhood, public and private bodies, ideal bodies, masked bodies) of black women and lesbians in contemporary plural and hybrid societies (*Yo Mama*, 1993). Vrsilj Crgolov allegorises the instrumentalism of post-socialist violence in the Ukraine (*Forced Violence*, 1994). Richard Billingham (1970) takes series of photographs which mark the life of his family, i.e. the family of the English working class in an era of neo-liberalism (*No Name*, 1995). Maurizio Cattelan (1960) deals with the phenomenon of presenting power – in order for power to be defeated, says the artist, it has to come closer, to be assumed once again and to be repeated endlessly (*La Nona Ora*, 1999). Tomo Savic Gecan (1967) presents the verbal and shows the mentally public and private spaces of every-day life (*The Sports Hall in Zagreb*, 1995). Bernard Fuchs (1971) documents the every-day life of the northern Austrian population (*photographs from 1995-96*). Kultug Ataman (1961) documents every-day private and public life of a transvestite (*Semiha B. Unplugged*, 1997). Christof Kinter (1973) designed unusual objects similar to kitchen appliances, massagers or vibrators which appear in the consumer system as *secret objects of desire* (*Have you got it?*, 1998). Vanessa Beecroft (1969) researches the female public visible figure, above all, the fashion model (*Show*, 1998). Zivko Grozdanic (1957) works with political, religious, economic and every-day *traumas* of post-socialist and transitional Serbian society (*Meteor rain*, 2005). The group *Schie 2.0* work in the domain of researching and problematising public rules and norms of organisations and the use of space in Dutch society (*Holland is a Well-Regulated Country*, 1999). Katarzyna Kozyra (1963) works with models of performing displays of illness, as well as male and female, that is, transvestite identity in post-socialist culture (*Male Bathroom*, 1999). Nikola Pilipovic (1958) indexed the appearance of representatives of other races in post-socialist Serbian mono-racial culture (*From China to Banat*, 2000). Franko B. presents the erotic male body in every-day distancing and violence (*Milk and Blood*, 2000). Milan Atanaskovic (1960)

researches urban archeology confronting industrial machines destroyed in fire with operated and removed tumours (*Negating Corossions*, 2000). Aleksandar Batista Ilic (1965) together with Ivan Keser and Tomislav Gotovec carried out a series of public and private, but documented, performances by which a unified behavioural, sexual, micro-political life of these three artists is indexed (*Weekend Art: Hallelujah Hill* 1996-2000). Nikola Pilipovic and Marija Vauda documented the work and behaviour of micro-social institutions (*Rubber Department*, 2001). Vladimir Nikolic isolated specific and indicative forms of behaviour (the act of Christening) in the politically, religious climate of post-socialist Serbia (*Ritam*, 2001). Georges Adeagbo carried out an eclectic and hybrid installation with objects of every-day and political life of the third world (*The Meeting between Africa and Japan*, 2001). Zoran Naskovski (1960) worked with documentary materials from different cultures and their paradoxical face to face meetings (*Death in Dallas*, 2001). Zlatko Kopljar (1962) located the meta-physics of living on primary bodily and physiological processes, as well as their isolated symbolisations (*K8*, 2002). Sanja Ivekovic made a unified project of carrying out and presenting female identity through differences of the private and public in the every-day life of kindred micro and macro-politics (*Female House*, 1998-2002). Ksenija Turcic (1963), for example, shows her private emotional life through *text messages* as a public work of art (*SMS video installation*, 2003). Marjetica Potrc (1953) researches entropical urban and micro-geographical entropy systems of architectural shaping of human living (*Next Stop, Kiosk*, 2003). Tracey Emin (1963) carries out spaces of privacy, for example the view of the bedroom (1999). Keith Edmier (1967) works with mechanical and prosthetic finishing of the human body (*Beverly Edmier, 1967*, 1998). Jake (1966) and Dinos (1962) Chapman realize bio-political installations as traces of spending human life: *Arbeit McFries* (2001). Etc. etc. In other words: (1) while traditional painter's bourgeois realisms of the 19th or the socially-critical realisms of the 20th century tended towards religious or optimal visual presentations of the natural and social world outside of art, (2) while avant-garde and neo-avant-garde anti or post-painting 'realisms' (specificism, new realism, neo dada, pop art, arte povera) tended towards textual **post-disanovskom** moving of world objects outside art into the exceptional and critical world of art, (3) simulational and media realism at the end of the 1990's was created as a media prefiguration of real or fictional information and their erased and moved traces in relation to the picture and words in constituting the social ideology of globalism, that is, the *post-conflict second* (post-communist) or *third* (post-colonial) *world*. An act it is, and this is the ontological determinant, a media formation of information which prefigures the functions of context in the production of social meaning about problems within post-socialist (transitional), civil European, liberal American, or post-colonial society. Art becomes a *probe* for testing and prefiguring culture in its social possibilities of function, context, and production of public meaning.

Literature: Brian Wallis, (ed.), *Blasted Allegories - An Anthology of Writings by Contemporary Artists* (The MIT Press, 1987); Marcia Tucker, Karin Fiss, ... (eds), *Discourses: Conversation in Postmodern Art and Culture* (The MIT Press, 1990); *Abject Art* (Witney Museum of American Art, 1993); *Manifesta 1* (Rotterdam, 1996); *Documenta X - the book* (Cantz, 1997); Branka Stipančić, Tihomir Milovac (eds), *Budućnost je sada - Ukrajinska umjetnost devedesetih* (Muzej suvremene umjetnosti, 1999); *After the Wall* (Moderna Musset, 1999); *Manifesta 3* (Ljubljana, 2000); *Konverzacija* (Muzej savremene umjetnosti, 2001); *Documetna 11_Platform 5: Exhibition - Catalogue* (Hatje Cantz Publishers, 2002); Aleš Erjavec (ed), *Postmodernism and the Postsocialist Condition - Politicized Art under Late Socialism* (California University Press, 2003); Francesca Alfano Miglietti, *Extreme Bodies - The Use and Abuse of the Body in Art* (SKIRA, 2003).

Art in the age of terrorism is the name given to contemporary art practices which treat occurrences and manifestations of terrorism/terror in the age of globalism. The

term relates to (1) art practices which treat terrorism in the sphere of global and public systems of art and media, (2) activist cultural and social practices which by means of aesthetisation and art presentation interfere and communicate their political terrorist and pro-terrorist platforms, and (3) terrorist actions which are recognised, identified, and interpreted by discourses of aesthetisation and comparative reference towards art. Art in the age of terrorism has productions in high gallery, museum, and art-media art (performance, video, photography, installations, internet) and in popular culture, above all, film and television series. This is about art productions which are visible, and therefore, prefigured in communication of unspeakable violence, conspiracy politics, traumatic sufferings, evil existence, violence of these and these parties, racial, ethnic, class-based, religious, etc. in narratives and occurrences of terrorism. On the other hand, this is about art productions which research, analyse, deconstruct or spectacularly prefigure mass media presentations of terrorism carried out and distributed in popular culture. The approaches which lead to prefiguring dramatic events of terrorism in every-day life differ from approaches which turn to meta-physical prefiguration particular or universal evil, that is, visual formations of power and evil. For example, the American artist Matthew Barney in the film/performance/video *Cremaster 3* (2002) works with meta-physical relations of power and evil. That is, we can speak about art and terrorism by means of media activism such as internet-activism, internet terrorism and internet-political actionism (the Zapatista movement, Hakim Bey, the Critical Art Ensemble group).

Terrorism is shown as a social occurrence which has the character of an 'experimental probe' for testing social secrets, public or private relations in peaceful or state-of-emergency situations. Works of art which relate to contemporary terrorism use media presentations which are developed in concepts of 'art in the age of culture' as documentary media (photography, film, video), communication media (press, television, internet), and thus induced presentations of art performance and the art of installation.

'Terrorism' is shown as a theme which should be prefigured by means of remembering the tragic event or marking the tragic events in or outwith discourses of political propaganda (memorial American movies about *September 11*). Certain authors go into a critical, deconstructive or parodical (Gillermo Gomez-Pena) performing or media discussion with prejudices and ideological screens which establish discourses about 'terrorism' in ruling social every-day life. Gomez-Pena for example, masks himself to look – exactly like – terrorists from the third, or South-American, world. It carries out an art work with an ethnic or racial identification of a **klisetiziranog** appearance of a 'terrorist' or with manipulations of public opinion about terrorism from *conspiracy theories* to *public stigmatization*.

Media manipulations of 'terrorism' lead towards production of visual and media prefigured atmospheres of uncertainty, panic, xenophobia and aggressiveness towards the *other* and the *unknown* in contemporary western societies. While the *unknown* and the *other*, in the West, in the art of the Cold War (movies about the secret agent James Bond) identified itself in connection with the secret politics of the USSR, today, that other and unknown is identified with the racial or the religious other, for example, the Islamic world (the countless cinema movies about Islamic terrorism) or South-American societies. The third world is demonised and prefigured as the world of inscrutable evil or secret danger. The contradictions of contemporary terrorism are set up in the artistic productions of: Pia Lindman, Doron Solomons, Jacqueline Salloum, Laurie Anderson, Walid Raad, Brenda Oelbaum, Khaled D.

Ramadan, Xu Bing, and others. For example, in his video installation *Someone Else's Everyday Reality* (2004), Khaled D. Ramadan in parts executes a *ready-made* presentation of terrorist video material. Documentary material is used through which 'authentic' live pictures of terrorists were presented, who sacrificed their life for their religious and political goal. One of the characteristic parts of popular culture which is confronted with the prefiguration of legitimacy of 'digital terrorism' and 'digital alternatives' in a spectacular way, is the film trilogy *Matrix* (1999, 2003) by brothers Andy and Larry Wachowski.

Literature: Matthew Barney, *Cremaster 3* (Guggenheim Museum, 2003); Ricardo Dominguez, "Electronic Disturbance Theater – Timeline 1994-2002" (*TDR* vol. 47 no. 2 T178, 2003, str. 132-133); Hakim Bej, *T.A.Z. – Temporarna autonomna zona, Ontološka anarhija, Poetski terorizam* (CSU, 2003); Gerardo Mosquera, JeanFisher (eds), *Over Here – International Perspectives on Art and Culture* (New Museum of Contemporary Art i The MIT Press, 2004); [Matt Lawrence](#), *Like a Splinter in Your Mind: The Philosophy Behind the Matrix Trilogy* (Blackwell, 2004); Graham Coulter-Smith, Maurice Owen (eds), *Art in the Age of Terrorism* (Paul Holberton publishing 2005).

Art in a lingering state marks art productions of situations or events. The philosopher and aesthetician Yves Michaud created the concept of *lingering works of art* (*l'art l'état gazeux*). Pointing out the importance of 'relation' (relation – for example according to Nicholas Buriou), and thus, *executions*, and not created, made, or produced whole and completed there-present pieces, is set up as a result of the change of technological, conceptual and functional characterisations of art and cultural media in carrying out the public domain or art and culture. This is about cultures in which the relationship of art and cultural practices is 'open' and 'relative'. By new media and practices from digital technology to strategies/tactics of the spectacle, 'cultural relations' are presented and not completed products: *objects*. The concept of *lingering art work* should be differentiated from the concept which Lucy R. Lippard set up in an attempt to define conceptual art as the *dematerialisation of an art object*. Yves Michaud, on the contrary, shows that *art in a lingering state* is a result of changed organisation of material social practices in culture and art, and not a process of destroying art work as an object. Art work is media strengthened and presented as just a *cultural and social activity of events*, by intermediaries which are different from intermediaries of *traditional* works of art. Michaud pointed out a paradoxical turnover. These processes, those within the world of art and the one which develops in the seat of industrial culture, cannot be found anywhere anymore. This does not mean, whatever lovers of great style and virtue may think, that art work has disappeared. On the contrary, it is greater than ever. Active and even hyper-active, it mingled everywhere with stunning sensitivity. Marcel Duchamp's grandchildren, and even great-grandchildren, own art places and put out *ready-made* everywhere. Hoards of tourists rush towards museums which do not represent art but are art themselves, some kind of spa or resort in which culture is transformed into a cure of aesthetic experiences. The industry of culture, with stunning inventiveness, takes care of all else, from design of communal equipment to branded clothes, from lift music to *fitness* halls, from seasonal best-sellers to regimed diets. Michaud stresses how it is truly crazy that this world (he means the first world or every other world prepared for tourists of the first world) is beautiful, except in museums and art centres – there, something else is maintained from the same source, and actually the same thing: aesthetic experience but in its own pure abstraction – that which remains of art when it becomes smoke or gas.

Yves Michaud, calling on Benjamin and Adourne, shows another characteristic problem with 'aura'. Just like aesthetics is separated from artistic and is prefigured as an effect of cultural production, that is how the need for 'aura' and the

auratic impression in culture is established. “We need aura, however unnatural it is. We need feeling, even if it means feeling to feel. We need identities and orientations, even if they have to change equally like fashion.” Because, what happened to the *aura* after Benjamin’s critical and Adourne’s critical diagnoses from the 1930’s and 1960’s. Did *aura* disappear with the strategies and tactics of the *ready-made*, photographs, films, videos, digital processing of information, with mass and popular expenditure in place of elite exchange and contemplation of the highest values, etc...? How should one understand the concept and occurrence of ‘aura’ in and around artistic work? Is *aura* an intriguing invention to justify the fascinations of art work which cannot be reasonably justified? Is *aura* something which has become the contextualising *world of art* or *world of culture*? That is, is *aura* some kind of discursive and semiological ‘capsule’ or sensual ‘cover’ around a piece of art which gives it new meaning? Is *aura* just an *action* of the happening of events in accordance with sensual and meaningful potentials? Michaud offered a concept, radicalising and distorting Benjamin, that the disappearance of the *aura* from art work in the era of mass media reproduction did not happen. Instead, it came to a division between *art work* and *aura*. In other words, it is as though it did not come with media mass and popular industry to the dying out of the *spirit* in art work, but rather that it came to an exiting of the ‘spirit’ or ‘action’ from art work into the world. As though aesthetic or art work exist in a world independent of the body of art work, as though the work lost its reason for existence while ‘activity’ of art, or more accurately, the activity of the aesthetic becomes that which is produced, worked, exchanged, moved, accepted, absorbed, and definitely, *spent* in pleasure which is not just an ideality of aesthetic pleasure. Michaud, therefore, concluded that: “In the continuation of this last reflex, I set out the concept that art is no longer a spiritual expression but something like an ornament or jewellery of the age. From autonomous and organic activity which has its own life, we changed over, speaking like Simmel, to style, from style to decoration and from decoration to jewellery. One step more, just a step, and the smell stays, irradiation, petrol; Parisian air, Duchamp would say. Art then withdraws into experience which is no longer an experience of the subjects surrounded by *aura*, but *aura* which is not connected to anything or hardly anything. This *aura*, that aureola, that smell, that petrol, call it what you like, expresses through fashion the identity of the age.” The division of ‘work’ and ‘aura’ points to a turnover from autonomous art work in a social event into performing, which happens as the sole shaping and decorating of life outwith evoking and leaning on ‘work’ or, furthermore, cultural productions: *artifacts*. *Sole activity* exists, attraction, affectation, performing and therefore, designing, which is like it is derived from art, but it no longer needs art because it works with just the effects. The aesthetic event is crucial and not its carriers, whose every-day life is organised: from bathing with sweet soaps and wearing sweet-smelling, coloured underwear, to tattooing your body, body-building, driving in an eclectically-designed model of a small automobile-limousine, playing video games with exotic stories and traps which lead to *pointless work* of maximal concentration of every player to tourist travels to the most exotic destinations which exist only so that one can pass through them in a moment of *enjoyment* and *being alive*. But, while for Benjamin ‘aura’ had a mystic, mysterious and meta-physical evoking of nostalgia with its *source* in tradition, for Michaud, ‘aura’ is an organisation and production of intensity of life by means of technological description, expression or performance which does not require an intermediary role of ‘art work’. The cultural industry found new ‘media’ and ‘technologies’ by which the activity of art work was multiplied, and by this, transferred to care, decoration, and hygiene of the

body, dress fashion, tourism, entertainment, expenditure, and all-following forms of spectacular dealings of developed cultural industries. Cultural *intensities* and *activities* are *auratic*, but without a source and without a 'piece' from which they exist. From *aura of work*, to *aura without work*, the road led from materialism of work towards materialism of practice. Only practice and its *auras* exist, i.e. actions of different intensities in shapings and re-shapings of life.

Literature: Walter Benjamin, „Umetničko delo u veku svoje tehničke reprodukcije“ (*Eseji*, Nolit, 1974, str. 119); Teodor V. Adorno (1979), „Izraz i konstrukcija“ (*Estetička teorija*, Nolit, 1978, str. 93-94); Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Verso, 1992); Nikolas Burio, “Relaciona estetika” (*Košava* br. 42-43, 2003); Yves Michaud, *Umjetnost u plinovitu stanju – esej o trijumfu estetike* (Naklada Ljevak, 2004).

Virno, Paulo (1952) is a contemporary Italian philosopher. He received a PhD with his thesis on Theodore Adorno at the University of Rome. He was a member of the socialist, working, neo-Marxist, anarchic and post-situational *Autonomist* movement (*Autonoma*). He was a member of the *Potere Operaio* movement until its dismemberment in 1973. He was arrested with the editorial staff of the magazine *Metropoli* in the early 1980's and was accused of belonging to the *Red Brigades*. He spent a few years under 'preventive supervision', after which he was freed of all charges for militant/armed, political activism. He was the editor of the magazine *Luogo Comune* from 1990-1993. He was a lecturer at the University of Urbino, the University of Montreal, and the University of Calabria. Paolo Virno worked in the fields of political theory, linguistics, communication studies and philosophy. He is close to Italian anarchic, socialist and Marxist theoreticians such as Mario Tronti, Antonio Negri, Franco Berardi, Maurizio Lazzarato and others. He published many books, among which was *A Grammar of Multitude – A Supplement to the Analysis of Contemporary Life Forms* (2001), which received international recognition.

Virno's philosophical work was based on critical and analytical theory set up from Karl Marx through Walter Benjamin and Hannah Arendt to contemporary post-structuralist theory, above all, theories of power of Michel Foucault and philosophy of events of Gilles Deleuze. He worked on analytically-established concepts of 'general intellect' (*General Intellect, Intellecto generale*) in Marx's writings, and thus on the concept of multitude, work, post-Fordism, power, etc. Globalisation brought about a repeated questioning of categories such as 'people'. According to Virno, this is about the turnover from Thomas Hobbes' concept of 'people' towards Baruch de Spinoza's concept of 'multitude'. The second problem is the critical analysis of fundamental changes in the nature of capitalism in the 1980's and 1990's. Virno marked this change by the phenomenon of the crucial role of multitude and socialist character of post-Fordism: post-Fordism is the communism of capital. Unlike the concept of people, multitude is a plurality which rejects political unity and which does not transform laws into sovereignty, thus which rejects compliance and does not lean towards representative democracy. A change in the nature of work leads towards new shapes and relations of production, exchange and expenditure – a change from industrial production towards extending services, but also new forms of deciding about relations which is determined by an all-greater erasing of borders between politics and work. Therefore, the industry of communication (i.e. spectacles, cultural industry) is an industry like every other. It is a novelty that the industry of communication becomes an industry of production of the means of production. Traditional Marxist division on the base and on outbuilding attains a new character of 'innovating' the modus of communication, perception and events of reality.

Literature: Paolo Virno, *Gramatika mnoštvo – Prilog analizi suvremenih formi života* (Jasenski i Turk, 2004); Paolo Virno, “Čudo, virtuoznost i već viđeno” (*Tvrđa* br. 1-2; 2005); Sylvère Lotringer, “We, the Multitude” (*Social Text* vol. 23, no. 1, 2005); [Paolo Virno](#), *Multitude Between Innovation and Negation* (The MIT, 2008);

World music is an obvious example of globalisation in culture/art. The term *World Music* mainly has three uses: (1) *World Music* is the collective name for different music which is included in the collective concept of musical creation of the human kind – the term is used similarly with the terms *painting* and *world literature*, (2) *World Music* is the name for the ‘world of music’, i.e. for that contextual frame of meaning, knowledge, understanding and identification in which music work appears in its unity – the term is used similarly with Arthur Danto’s ‘world of art’ (*art world*) and (3) *World Music* is the name for genre of hybrid genre of popular music which is based on western interpretation of *national* (folklore, authentic) non-European or out-of-high-art and out-of-popular-urban-media (rock, pop) musical productions and traditions of the West. The term *World Music* is most commonly used in this third sense, as a genre of popular music. *World Music* is a genre when it is interpreted as a *branch* of contemporary western or pro-western music and when ‘hegemony’ of contemporary western music, in relation to traditional and post-traditional non-western musical practices, is stressed. *World Music* is a trans-genre when it is interpreted as a practice of ‘transition’ from national popular music of non-European and marginal cultures into western, mass media culture. When one points to the multi-direction movements, from non-western music to western music, and from western music to non-western music, this is poly-genre. *World Music* is not a simple *depiction* or *expression of a globalised society*, but is rather one of the market-controlled mechanisms of construing and carrying out multi-culturalism on global platforms of the prefigured world. This music is not created in a cultural atmosphere of autonomous musical creation, but instead in obvious practices of executing politically-determined, globalising realities. Pop and rock music are the *music bases* by which local, regional or marginal music is recycled and re-semantized by being brought into the ‘global world’ of entertainment and expenditure. *World Music* can be interpreted as a musical-construct of social reality on the crossing from post-modern pluralism and its own suitable hybrid multi-culturalism in the post-block period of setting up *empires*. This is about establishing two large empires at the beginning of the 21st century: the USA and the EU. Empires change autonomous constituents of plural multi-culturalism of the post-modern era into ‘filtered’ multi-culturalism, which means a presentation of autonomous (authentic: whatever that means) identity using discourse and media of the massive western culture. In this sense, *World Music* is a constituent of the reality of the age of *empire* because it starts from ‘traditional’ musical samples of non-European or marginally-western cultures and changes them medially, based on the example of western popular mass and media music. Therefore, *World Music* is a construct of the *new world* because it participates in the creation of *empire*. *World Music* is a symptom of the *new world* because it leads into a non-verbal *mantle* of a reconstrued globalised body of the listener/consumer. Then, however, *World Music* also becomes a symptom in which in a pre-verbal or post-verbal way, the obvious sliding away from the global takes place, which hides the local, thus local, which globally makes it *unwhole*, precisely on the musical plan: listening to sourceful music which sounds like famous pop-rock and listening to pop-rock which disappears in the web of expectation from local sound, i.e. a gig. In this example we can see the clear demand that the ‘aesthetically judging of work’ becomes a critical analysis of the instrumental status and function of *World Music* in the contemporary world. Why? Two important social processes are confronted for

which 'music' or 'art' are means of achieving a new macro or micro identity. The process of globalisation is in question, which by an example of market-oriented popular and mass culture builds a planetary horizon of expectation of global identity, while on the other hand, is a process of 'fragmentation' which in a local and regional sense sees its own reason for existence as *sourceful* and *authentic*.

Literature: David Byrne, „Zašto mrzim *World Music*“, Đorđe Tomić, „*World Music*: formiranje transžanrovskog kanona“, John Hutnyk, „Adorno na Womad-u: južnoazijski grossover i granice govora hibridnosti“, Steven Feld, „Od šizofrenij do šizmogeneze: *World Music* i *World Beat* kao diskursi i prakse komodifikacije“, Mirjana Laušević, „Biranje nasleđa: zašto Amerikanci pevaju pesme sa Balkana“, *Reč* br. 65, Beograd, 2002, str. 309-402.

Zapatistas, digital, i.e. digital zapatism, is a Mexican political, cultural and art movement against state dictatorship and global circulation of capital and power which arose in 1994. Digital zapatism is a part of the movement *The Zapatista Army of National Liberation* or *Ejercito Zapatista de Liberacion Nacional* or *EZLN*. *EZLN* is an armed revolutionary group from Chiapas, one of the poorest Mexican states. The movement got its name from Emiliano Zapata (1879-1919) who led the Mexican Revolution between 1910 and 1920. The term 'zapatistas' marks the almost hundred-year battle against imperialism. They believe in activist intervention through the internet as well as through coordination of non-governmental organisations (NGO and solidarity groups). They perceive themselves as part of a greater anti-global and anti-neoliberal social movement. They stand for control of local resources in the world in which they live in, controlling their own lives in accordance with their own customs and laws, and thus preserving social life autonomously from government influence.

ELZN is a movement towards radical democracy based on the negotiation delight of the Mayas which is brought into communicative computer networks as a virtual activity for actual peace in an actual society of the *Chiapas*. Digital zapatism is an anti-neoliberal and anti-global movement established on activist execution of *electronic civil disobedience* and *disturbance* of social, political, cultural and art disturbance. For example, one of the activities of electronic civil disobedience is the acting through programmes which *bury*, and thus block email addresses of selected centres of neo-liberal power. The enemy of digital zapatistas is located in public commercial networks (commercial communication systems, information systems, financial data systems, transportation systems, network internet services). The tactics of network guerillas are based on alternative networkings, in-depth programming (creating *spider*, *boots* and other minor network agents), creating *offshore domains*, creating simple *access systems for actual timely* inter-continental electronic communication, purchasing of personal satellites, etc. For example, the artist Guillermo Gomez-Pena (1955), who designed the theatricalisation of *off line* zapatista activities, is associated with zapatista activities and performances. Gomez-Pena researches, provokes, simulates and archives Mexican identities in digital-network and life performances. He lives and works in the United States since 1978. The greatest part of his interventive productions relates to social and cultural relations/differences between Mexico and the United States. His performances are based on masking. He often worked with artists such as Roberto Sifuentes and Coco Fusco. He works closely on *multiple media* such as radio, video, installations, essay books, poetry and chronicles published in English and Spanish, i.e. in the language in-between, *Spanglish*.

The Electronic Disturbance Theatre: EDT is a small activist group made up of *cyber* activists and artists (Ricardo Dominguez/Carmin Karasic/Brett Stalbaum/Stefan Wray) engaged in the development of theory and practice of electronic and civil

disturbance and provocation. They have been active since 1998. EDT works with connecting different, radically political, performing and software activities through a system which is called *Flood Net*. For digital zapatistas and EDT partners, *cyberspace* is a new public space in which a political struggle for social changes takes place. They develop the so-called *hacktivism* which is based on the connection of political activism and computer attacks, i.e. illegal hacker or unauthorised provocations in computer systems and networks.

Ricardo Dominguez (1959) was born in Las Vegas, Nevada, USA. He moved to New York at the beginning of the 1990's. He became a professor at *UCSD (University of California San Diego)* in 2004. He worked with numerous groups associated with digital or net activism. He worked with a group which developed *Virtual-Sit-In* technology in 1998, he was solidated with zapatista communities in Chiapas, Mexico, he is the co-founder of *The Electronic Disturbance Theatre (EDT)* and a former member of the *Critical Art Ensemble* group (1987-1994). He set up and developed the theory of 'electronic civil disobedience' in the late 1980's.

Literature: Aleksandar Bošković (ed), *Critical Art Ensemble: Digitalni partizani - Izbor tekstova*, CSU, Beograd, 2000; Ricardo Dominguez, "Digital Zapatismo" (1998), <http://www.thing.net/rdom/ecd/DigZap.html>; Ricardo Dominguez, "Electronic Disturbance Theater – Timeline 1994-2002" (*TDR* vol. 47 no. 2 T178, 2003, str. 132-133); Coco Fusco, *Corpus Delecti: Performance Art of the Americas*, outledge New York, 1999; Coco Fusco (ed), *Hacktivism: Network-Art-Activism*, Autonomedia Press, 2001; www.ctheory.org ;

Life is a very undetermined concept (term + theme) which is relevant for defining total human conditionality and potential. 'Life' as a term appears as a legal term, scientific term, but also as a marking for the precise fact of living or a particular way of life. Sensibly speaking, 'life' is the name for the contradiction which threatens death.

Hannah Arendt suggested the thesis on 'human conditionality' in political anthropology, developing the difference between the antique concept of 'bios politikos' and the Middle-Age Latin equivalent of 'vita activa'. *Bios politikos* explicitly marks only the area of human relations: stressing action, *praxis*, necessary for its establishment and preservation, whereby 'work' and 'production' are seen outside the *bios*. The concept of 'vita activa' includes in itself all human activity as a whole. The difference between contemplative non-activity and active work was also created. Hannah Arendt established the *human condition* through conceptual differentiation of public and private, thus classifying activities as work, production and operation.

Giorgio Agamben set up the problem of life as a problem of potential, i.e. as a *possibility for something*. Life which cannot be separated from its form is life which is, as its own way of living, concerned about that living itself, and living in life, above all, is about its own way of living. This allegation refers to life – human life – in which specific ways, acts and processes of life are never only *facts*, but are always, and above all, *possibilities* of life, always and foremost power. Behaviours and shapes of human life are not set towards certain biological formations or appointed by any kind of necessity, but rather, however usual they may be, and however much society repeats and asserts them, they always retain a character of possibility – that is, they always pose living itself in the question. Because of that, the human being is a being of power and potential from which it can, but does not have to, create, i.e. it can succeed or fall short of, get lost or find itself. Man is the only creature whose living always deals with happiness. It deals with a creature whose life is incorrigibly and painfully assigned to events which may have a positive result. This, however, immediately sets up life-form as a political life.

Literature: Walter Benjamin, „Povijesno-filozofijske teze“, iz *Uz kritike sile – eseji* (Studentski centar sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1971); Hannah Arendt, *Vita Activa* (Biblioteka August Cesarec, 1991); Giorgio Agamben, „Form-of-Life“, iz Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt (eds), *Radical Thought in Italy – A Potential Politics* (University of Minnesota Press, 1996, str. 151-156); Giorgio Agamben: *Infancy and History – the Destruction of Experience* (Verso, 2007); *Language and Death: The Place of Negativity* (University of Minesota Press, 1991); *Stanzas: Word and Phantasm in Western Culture* (University of Minnesota Press, 1993); *Homo sacer – Suverena moć i goli život* (Multimedijski institut, 2006); *The Man without Content* (Stanford University Press, 1999); *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy* (Stanford University Press, 2000); *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive* (Zone Books 2002); *The Open: Man and Animal* (Stanford University Press, 200); *State of Exception* (The University of Chicago Press, 2005).

Žižek, Slavoj (1949) is a Slovenian philosopher and sociologist born in Ljubljana who opts for Lacan's (Jacques Lacan, 1901-1981) theoretical psycho-analysis. He received a PhD in philosophy at the University of Philosophy in Ljubljana in 1981, and then did a second doctoral thesis in theoretical psycho-analysis at the University of Paris VIII (*Paris VIII*) in 1985. He is employed as a researcher in the *Institute for Sociology and Philosophy*, later re-named the *Institute for Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana* from 1979. He is a guest lecturer at numerous European and American universities (Paris, USA). He was politically active in alternative movements in Slovenia during the 1980's. He was a presidential candidate of the republic of Slovenia during the first multi-party elections in 1990.

Žižek's materialistic theory of society and culture was formed with the change of Lacan's theoretical psycho-analysis into a critical interpretive theory of society and culture. The development of the philosopher Slavoj Žižek led from Marxism and Heideggerism, through psycho-analysis as theories of sexuality and subject, towards theoretical psycho-analysis as a theory of society and culture. In Lacan's theoretical psycho-analysis there exists a theoretical promise which leads from the biology of culture. Lacan, however, always kept the necessity of biological determination, i.e. verbal sexual and materially unconscious sub-determination of the subject. With Slavoj Žižek, who was born, educated and socially formed in a totalitarian or quasi-totalitarian self-governed society of socialist Yugoslavia, there existed from early texts, on the contrary, an intention to locate the meaning of social (in Naxism, Stalinism, self-governed society) and then, cultural (in post-socialism, transitional societies, late capitalism and global capitalism). The development of Žižek's thinking about society and culture follows Lacan's structuralist changeover of Freudian psycho-analysis and leads towards the release of the unconscious from biological meaning and coming closer to the unconscious and language, that is, human practices. On this kind of Lacan basis, Žižek carried out redefined cultural studies (*cultural studies*, above all, popular culture studies) and in this way pointed out: (a) a chain of analogy between the unconscious, (language) and culture as material (causal, non-linguistic) concepts or systems, (b) from language he moved on to a signified level and from the signified level to questions of objects, in other words, (c) he established criteria for interpreting culture by means of desire models and pleasure (*jouissance*) pointing out the functions of a phantasm, the role of ideology and critical effects of symptoms in relation to the subject and in relation to inter-subjective constellations, at that, (d) cultural ideas stop being a neutral non-conflictual text as in structuralism and post-structuralism, becoming an 'event' of objects or cases which are materialistically read-out, explained, and interpreted in conflictual possibilities and impossibilities of social struggle within the realities of culture. Žižek's approach is materialistic and is not post-structuralist, because it does not interpret the subject as an effect of the arbitrary or plural textual work but symbolically, which determines the subject and interprets efficiencies of external material necessity which permeates it and therefore defines it. He developed and changed basic Lacanist and Marxist, that

is, Hegel's models as they are: unconscious, signifier, *stitched point*, fetishism, cynicism, phantasm, ideology, bureaucracy, symptom, object *a*, excessive identification, a desire of the second, pleasure (*jouissance*), repetition, a critique of meta-language, Reality, Imaginary, Symbolically, deficiency/shortcoming, sublimely, etc. His critical analysis of Lacan and Marx (1818-1883) is based, for example, on the concept of exorbitant identification, and this means in a demonstration of a disturbance of the 'normal' status of things. On the basis of Lacan's theoretical psycho-analysis, Žižek establishes a critical theory of western culture in a wide spread from constituting enlightening modernism in the 18th century to actual movements of globalism after the fall of the Berlin Wall (transition, globalism, terrorism, global and local wars, popular mass culture). In more than one report and book, Žižek played around with the occurrences of contemporary societies in the era of globalisation – he wrote about the war-time disintegration of Yugoslavia and the role of Serbian nationalism in his book *Metastasis of Pleasure*. He wrote about the *phenomenology* of 'September 11th', and this means multiple terrorism in the age of globalism, in his book *Welcome to the Desert of Reality*. He wrote about the war in Iraq and the basic change in American politics after September 11th in his book *Iraq – A Borrowed Teapot*. In critiques of neoliberalism and eclectic post-modernism, Žižek points out the role of events of Reality which destroys the system of 'normality' and 'usualness', confronting us with the human catastrophe, and on the other hand, with the need for practising utopia.

Literature: Slavoj Žižek: *Znak Označitelj Pismo - Prilog materijalističkoj teoriji označiteljske prakse* (Mala edicija Ideja, 1976); *Hegel in označevalec* (Analecta, 1980); *Filozofija skozi psihoanalizo*, Analecta, 1984); *Birokratija i uživanje* (SIC, 1984); *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Lacan – But were Afraid to Ask Hitchcock* (Verso, 1992); *Enjoy Your Symptom! Jacques Lacan in Hollywood and Out* (Routledge, 1992), *Metastaze uživanja* (Biblioteka XX vek, 1996); *Sublimni oblik ideologije* (Arkzin, 2002); *Welcome to the Desert of the Real: Five Essays on September 11 and Related Dates* (Verso, 2002); *Organs without Bodies – Deleuze and Consequences* (Routledge, 2004); *Irak – Posuđeni čajnik* (Naklada Ljevak, 2005); Elizabeth Wright, Edmond Wright (eds), *The Žižek Reader* (Basil Blackwell, 1999); i *The Universal Exception: Selected Writings* (Continuum, 2006).

Author's biography

I publish under the name Misko Suvakovic. I have a PhD from the Faculty of Fine Arts at the University of Art in Belgrade in 1993. I lecture at the University of Music in Belgrade in the following subjects: "Applied Aesthetics" and "Aesthetics,

Poetics and Stylism of Contemporary Music”. I teach “Theory of Art”, “Theory of New Media”, “Theory of Digital Art” and “Hybrid Theory of Art” at the interdisciplinary post-graduate studies at the University of Art in Belgrade, where I am one of the coordinators of the *Group for Theory of Art and Media*. I teach “The History of Contemporary Art and Design” at the University of Architecture in Belgrade.

I was a member of the conceptualist Group 143 (1975-1980), I was a member of the informal theoretical community “The Community for Researching Space” (1982-1989) and I am a member of the theoretical-performing organisation “Theory which Walks” (2000-2007). I edited the magazine “Katalog 143” (*Catalogue 143*, 1976-1978). I edited the independent theoretical magazine “Mentalni prostor” (*Mental Space*, Belgrade, 1982-1987). I was a member of the editorial staff of “TransKatalog” (*TransCatalogue*, Novi Sad, 1995-1998). I am a member of the editorial staff of the magazine “Teorija koja hoda” (*Theory which Walks*, Belgrade, from 2001). I am a member of the editorial staff of “Razlika” (*Difference*, Tuzla, 2002). I am a member of the editorial staff of “Sarajevske sveske” (*Sarajevo Notebook*, Sarajevo, 2005). I am a member of the editorial staff of “Art Luk” (*Art Look*, Warsaw, 2006). I published the following books: *Scene Jezika. Uloga teksta u likovnin umetnostima. Fragmentarne istorije 1920-1990 knj. 1 i 2*, (*Scenes of the Language. The Role of Text in Fine Arts. Fragmented Histories 1920-1990 books 1 & 2*), ULUS, Belgrade, 1989; *PAS TOUT – Fragments on art, culture, politics, poetics and art theory 1994-1974*, Meow Press, Buffalo, 1994; *Prolegomena za analitičku estetiku (Prolegomenon for analytical aesthetics)*, Četvrti talas, Novi Sad, 1995; *Postmoderna (73 pojma)*, (*The Post-modern (73 Concepts)*), Narodna knjiga, Belgrade, 1995; *Asimetrični drugi. Eseji o umetnicima i konceptima*, (*Asymmetric Others*), Prometej, Novi Sad, 1996; *Neša Paripović AUTOPORTRETI. Eseji o Neši Paripoviću*, (*Neša Paripović SELF-PORTRAITS. Essays about Neša Paripović*), Prometej, Novi Sad, 1996; *Slavko Bogdanović POLITIKA TELA. Eseji o Slavku Bogdanoviću*, (*Slavko Bogdanović POLITICS OF THE BODY. Essays about Slavko Bogdanović*), Prometej and K21K, Novi Sad, 1997; *Estetika apstraktnog slikarstva. Apstraktna umetnost i teorija umetnika 20-ih godina*, (*The Aesthetics of Abstract Painting. Abstract Art and Theory of Artists in the 1920's*), Narodna knjiga / Alfa, Belgrade, May 1998; *Pojmovnik moderne i postmoderne likovne umetnosti i teorije posle 1950*, (*Concepts of Modern and Post-modern Fine Arts and Theory after 1950*), SANU and Prometej, Belgrade and Novi Sad, 1999; *Koloman Novak LUMINOKINETIKA. Eseji o Kolomanu Novaku*, (*Koloman Novak LUMINOKINETICS. Essays about Koloman Novak*), Prometej, Novi Sad, 1999; *Point de Capiton. Eseji, fragmenti i meditacije o umjetnicima*, (*Point de Capiton. Essays, Fragments and Meditations about Artists*), Darko Šimičić and Božidar Raos edition, Zagreb, 2000; *Paragrami tela/figure: Predavanja i rasprave o strategijama i taktikama teorijskog izvođenja u modernom i postmodernom performance artu, teatru, operi, muzici, filmu i tehnoumetnosti*, (*Paragrams of the Body/Figure : Lectures and Discussions about Strategies and Tactics of Theoretical Execution in Modern and Post-modern Performance Art, Theatre, Opera, Music, Film and Techno-Art*), CENPI, Belgrade, 2001; *Figura, askeza in perverzija*, Hyperion, Koper, 2001; *Anatomija angelova. Razprave o umetnosti in teoriji v Sloveniji po letu 1960*, ZPS, Ljubljana, 2001; *Martek – Fatalne figure umjetnika – Eseji o umjetnosti i kulturi XX stoljeća u Jugoistočnoj, Istočnoj i Srednjoj Europi kroz djelovanje umjetnika Vlade Marteka*, (*Martek – Fatal Figures of Art – Essays about Art and Culture in 20th-century South-eastern, Eastern and Middle Europe through Works of Art by Vlade Martek*), Meandar, Zagreb, 2002;

Impossible Histories – Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-avant-gardes, and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918-1991, (co-editor with Dubravka Đurić), The MIT Press, Cambridge Mass, 2003; *Vlasta Delimar: monografija performans (Vlasta Delimar : A Monography of Performance)*, (co-author with Vlada Martek and Marijana Špoljar), Aerografika, Zagreb, 2003; *Politike slikarstva, (Politics of Painting)*, Edicija Artes, Koper, 2004; *Pojmovnik suvremene umjetnosti, (Concepts of Contemporary Art)*, Horetzky, Zagreba and Vlees & Beton, Ghent, 2005; *Mapiranje tijela/tijelom – Zlatko Kopljar, (Mapping of the Body – Zlatko Kopljar)*, Meandar, Zagreb, 2005; *Farenhajt 387 –Teorijske ispovesti, (Fahrenheit 387 – Theoretical Confessions)*, Orpheus, Novi Sad, 2006; *Studije slučaja – Diskurzivna analiza izvođenja identiteta u umetničkim praksama, (Case Studies – Discursive Analysis of Executing Identity in Artful Practices)*, Mali Nemo, Pančevo, 2006; *Diskurzivna analiza - Prestupi i/ili pristupi 'diskurzivne analize' filozofiji, poetici, estetici, teoriji i studijama umetnosti i kulture, (Discursive Analysis – Delinquency and/or Approaches to 'Discursive Analysis' of Philosophy, Poetics, Aesthetics, Theory and Studies of Art and Culture)*, University of Art in Belgrade, Belgrade, 2006; *Konceptualna umetnost, (Conceptual Art)*, MSUV, Novi Sad, 2007.