



VOLKS BANK

VOLKS BANK HRVATSKA

OBRTNIKI
PROLAZI

modna TKANINE
30 m

MAŠA--JELETIĆ--
STUDIO--

Magi

Kratka fantazija o ponovnom uspostavljanju vlasništva nad tijelom

Moje tijelo nije u mojem vlasništvu. Svoje tijelo koristim, kroz njega doživljam svijet. Tijelo mi u svakom smislu omogućuje percepciju okoline. Kada ne bih bila utjelovljena, ne bi mi bilo moguće čitati svijet oko sebe – to nešto oko mene bi bila amorfnu masu nečeg što ne bi bilo moguće niti detektirati niti definirati. Moje tijelo je stoga nužan preduvjet za definiciju svijeta. Pa ipak, koliko god utjelovljenje bilo ključno za moju egzistenciju – moje tijelo nije u mojem vlasništvu. Ono je pod stalnom navigacijom i opresijom protokola, arhitekture, prostornih struktura, drugih tijela, obrazovanja, socijalnih kodova, fizičkog, ekonomskog i emocionalnog preživljavanja, boli; s vremena na vrijeme, moje tijelo je pod opresijom i samoga sebe.

Ako tijelo nije u mojem vlasništvu to znači da ga dijelim s nekim drugim instancama, da neke druge instance polažu i egzekutiraju pravo da ga koriste; da ga usmjeravaju, da ga kontroliraju te da ga strukturiraju u područje odgovornosti. Ova fantazija razmišlja o tezi u kojoj je izvedbeni koreografski rad moguće mjesto ponovnog uspostavljanja primarnog vlasništva nad tijelom. Mjesto gdje u privremenom vremensko-prostornom okviru tijelo ponovno može biti u potpunosti pripadajuće vlastito. Te u kojem može uspostaviti susret s drugim tijelima koja su također privremeno vlastita, kako bismo (iako još uvijek opterećeni socijalnim kodovima) eventualno uspjeli uspostaviti neku drugu vrstu transfera jedni prema drugima, neku drugu vrstu humanističke pretpostavke, stvarajući neko drugo zajedničko polje od onoga koje je represivno opisano u svijet oko nas.

Marjana Krajač

Short Fantasy About Reclaiming the Ownership Over My Own Body

My body is not owned by me. I am using it, I am perceiving the world with it. Complete perception in what ever ground is possible only through the fact of embodiment. If I would not be embodied I would not be able to read the world – the world would be an amorphous unreadable mass of something indefinable. So, I am defining the world and myself in it via the body. Still, however essential my embodiment may be for my own existence, I am not the owner of my body. My body is repressed by protocols, architecture, space structures, other bodies, education, dance education, physical survival, economical survival, emotional survival, pain; and, at times my body is also repressed by its very self.

If I am not the owner, that means that I am sharing it with some other instance, that some other instances too claim and execute the right to use my body: to navigate it, to count on it, to take my body into the responsibility. Choreographic practice then would be the place to zoom into this consideration: of reclaiming the body for limited space-time frame in order to own it fully again. And, also to encounter other bodies in this frame which are also temporarily reclaimed, so that (though still burdened by our social codes) we can eventually establish some other form of transfer to each other, some other quality of humanoid consideration, some other common ground, instead of one that is repressively inscribed in the outer world.

Marjana Krajač

Umjetnost i rad

Piše Marko Kostanić

Pitanje rada, njegove organizacije i podjele, njegove funkcije unutar socijalne reprodukcije i ideologema koji ga okružuju u političkoj artikulaciji, vjerojatno je najzanimljiviji rakurs pristupa umjetničkim praksama. Samo formiranje institucije umjetničke autonomije i legitimacijski arsenal korišten u obrani društvene funkcije umjetnosti oslanjaju se na specifične distinkcije u odnosu na rad kao izvor društvenog bogatstva i fundamentalne okosnice organiziranja društva. Samim tim i pobuna s početka 20. stoljeća protiv buržoaske estetike, autonomije umjetnosti, njene socijalne i političke neutilitarnosti ili ideološke maskerade proizvodnih odnosa dominantno su se artikulirale, više ili manje eksplicitno, kroz probleme rada. Pored slučajeva napuštanja zone umjetničke proizvodnje i direktnog pristupanja industrijskoj proizvodnji i organizaciji radne svakodnevice kao u slučaju sovjetskih avangardnih pokreta, drugi oblik konstitutivnog tretiranja rada bila je demistifikacija samog radnog procesa proizvodnje umjetnosti i demitologizacija umjetničkog proizvoda. Na primjer, Duchampova gesta se temelji na razotkrivanju procesa umjetničke proizvodnje kroz demistifikaciju procesa cirkulacije, distribucije i konzumacije umjetnosti. Brechtov postupak pokazivanja, to jest izlaganja svih inače skrivenih proizvodnih mehanizama teatarskog događaja

Art and labour

By Marko Kostanić

The issue of labour, its organisation and division, its function in social reproduction and the ideologemes that surround it in its political articulation, are probably the most interesting perspectives one can take when approaching art practices. The very formation of the institution of artistic autonomy and the legitimating arsenal used in defence of the social function of art rely on specific distinctions regarding labour as the source of social wealth and a fundamental axis of the organisation of society. The early 20th century revolts against the bourgeois aesthetic, the autonomy of art, its social and political non-utility, and the ideological masquerade of the relations of production were indeed therefore dominantly articulated, more or less explicitly, through the issues of labour. Alongside instances of abandoning the zone of artistic production and directly joining industrial production and the organisation of everyday work, as in the case of Soviet avant-garde movements, another form of the constitutive treatment of labour was the demystification of the labour process of the production of art itself and the demythologisation of the art product. For example, the Duchamp gesture is founded in exposing the process of artistic production through demystifying the processes of the circulation, distribution, and consumption of art. Brecht's method of presenting the presenting, that is, of exhibiting all the normally hidden production mechanisms of a theatrical event does not only uncover the

ogoljuje teatarski rad, ali i demitologizira teatarski proizvod. Za razliku od Duchampa koji iako koristi proizvode nastale masovnom i standardiziranom proizvodnjom ne ukazuje na probleme organiziranja fordističke proizvodnje, kod Brechta taj postupak stoji i u direktnoj korelaciji s postupkom čitanja depolitiziranih proizvodnih odnosa i podjele rada van teatra. Osim intendiranih i eksplicitnih metoda raskrinkavanja odnosa umjetnosti i rada i umjetnosti kao rada, itekako je kroz dvadesetostoljetnu umjetnost prisutan i ideološki tretman rada kao nepolitičke prakse. Najvidljivija poveznica umjetnosti i rada prvo je djelo dominantne umjetnosti 20. stoljeća – film *Izlazak radnika iz tvornice*. Izostanak filmskog bilježenja onog vremena kojeg radnici provode u tvornici prije izlaska, jedan je od dominantnih faktora oblikovanja političkog imaginarija o radu kroz 20. stoljeće. U pokušaju rekonstrukcije povijesti filma iz perspektive odnosa filma i rada Harun Farocki zaključuje:

Prva kamera u povijesti kinematografije bila je uperena prema tvornici, no stoljeće kasnije mogli bismo reći da tvornica ne privlači film, štoviše ona ga odbija. Filmovi o radu ili radnicima nisu postali jednim od temeljnih žanrova, a prostor ispred tvornice ostao je na marginama. Većina narativnih filmova događa se u onom dijelu života koji počinje nakon što rad završi. [...] U filmu braće Lumière

work of theatre, but also demythologises the product of theatre. Unlike Duchamp, who does not point to the problems of organising Fordist production, his use of products made through mass and standardised production notwithstanding, in Brecht that method also stands in direct correlation with the method of reading depoliticised relations of production and division of labour beyond theatre. Besides the intended and explicit methods of exposing the relations between art and labour and art as labour, the ideological treatment of labour as a non-political practice has indeed been present throughout 20th century art. The most visible link between art and labour is the first piece of the twentieth century's dominant art – film *Workers Leaving the Lumière Factory*. The absence of a cinematic record of the time that the workers spend inside the factory before leaving is one of the dominant factors of shaping the political imaginary of labour across the 20th century. In an attempt to reconstruct the history of cinema from the perspective of the relations between cinema and labour, Harun Farocki concluded:

The first camera in the history of cinema was pointed at a factory, but a century later it can be said that film is hardly drawn to the factory and is even repelled by it. Films about work or workers have not become one of the main genres, and the space in front of the factory has remained on the sidelines. Most narrative films take place in that part of life where work has

iz 1895. može se naslutiti da se radnike sabralo iza tvorničkih vrata i da su preko praga nahrupili na snimateljevu zapovijed. Filmskoj režiji koja sažima subjekt prethodila je industrijska zapovijed koja je sinkronizirala živote mnoštva pojedinaca.

Problem rada u umjetnosti uvijek je usko vezan i uz status kojeg rad zauzima u političkim raspravama i borbi. Također, političko pozicioniranje umjetnika na ljevici iziskivalo je i produktivno formiranje odnosa spram radničke klase. U mnogo slučajeva taj odnos je bio baziran na opravdavanju i brisanju osjećaja klasne krivnje. Gore spomenuti primjer sovjetskih umjetnika funkcionirao je u imaginariju kao uspješan model uključivanja umjetnika u radni proces bez ostatka. Njegova uspješnost je toliko da se dominantna predodžba o povijesti SSSR-a i „izdaji“ revolucije poklapa sa nestankom avangardnih tendencija i uspostavljanjem režima socijalističkog realizma. Iako, to nam više govori o ovisnosti progresivnog statusa umjetničkih praksi o široj političkoj progresivnosti nego o utjecaju umjetnosti na razinu šire političke progresivnosti. Specifična historijska klopka u kojoj su se našli lijevi umjetnici i šira ljevica u pitanjima otuđenog rada svoj nastanak duguje

*been left behind... In the Lumière film of 1895 it is possible to discover that the workers were assembled behind the gates and surged out at the camera operator's command. Before the film direction stepped in to condense the subject, it was the industrial order which synchronized the lives of the many individuals.*¹

The problem of labour in the arts is also always closely linked to the status that labour occupies in political debates and struggles. Also, the political positioning of artists on the Left entailed a productive forming of a stance on the working class as well. In many cases, that stance was based on justifying and expunging the sense of class guilt. The above-mentioned example of Soviet artists operated in the imaginary as a successful model of the artists' total inclusion into the work process. So great was its success that the dominant conception of the history of the USSR and the "betrayal" of the revolution coincide with the disappearance of the avant-garde tendencies and establishment of the regime of socialist realism. Although, truth be told, that tells us more about the dependence of art practices' progressive status on wider political progressivity, than about any influence of art on the degree of wider political progressivity. The specific historic trap, in which leftist artists and the wider Left itself found themselves

1) Harun Farocki, „Izlazak radnika iz tvornice“ (2001), u BADco, *1 poor and one 0 / 1 siromašan i jedna 0* (katalog), Grac – Zagreb, 2008. *Le Journal des Laboratoires*

1) Harun Farocki, "Workers Leaving the Factory", http://archive.sensesofcinema.com/contents/02/21/farocki_workers.html

historijskoj situaciji u Sovjetskom savezu nakon Revolucije. Normativna predodžba o produktivnom susretu umjetnika i radnika u postrevolucionarnoj situaciji temeljila se na logici „na pola puta“. Radnici bi se nakon revolucionarnog prevrata oslobodili otuđenog rada i društvene podjele rada participacijom u kreaciji i planiranju radne organizacije, dok bi umjetnici ušli direktno u proizvodni proces nudeći kolektivu usluge virtuoznosti i imaginacije prethodno akumulirane u odijeljenom estetičkom polju. Ali, priželjkivani susret se nije dogodio, iako su se umjetnici direktno uključivali u organizaciju rada i svakodnevice. Razlozi su kao i uvijek geopolitičke i ekonomske prirode, a ne kognitivnih manjkavosti radnika ili umjetnika. Naime, nakon Revolucije, Prvog svjetskog rata i građanskog rata, Sovjetski savez je bio potpuno devastirana zemlja, bez razvijene industrijske proizvodnje i s ogromnom većinom seljačkog stanovništva koje je bilo uglavnom nepismeno. Također, izostalo je i tada očekivano izbijanje socijalističkih revolucija u Zapadnoj Evropi. Suočeni s iznimnim geopolitičkim pritiscima morali su krenuti u snažnu industrijalizaciju i morali su proizvesti proletarijat retroaktivno kao nositelja revolucionarno borbe. Način proizvodnje organiziran je na tejlorističkim principima. Poznata je Lenjinova elaboracija odluke o takvom načinu industrijalizacije: *Posljednja riječ kapitalizma u tom pogledu,*

regarding alienated labour, owes its emergence to the historical situation in the soviet union after the Revolution. In the post-revolutionary situation, the normative conception of a productive meeting between the artists and the workers was based on a “middle-of-the-road” logic. Following the revolutionary upheaval, the workers would break free from alienated labour and the social division of labour by participating in the creation and planning of organised labour, while the artists would enter directly into the production process, lending the collective their services of virtuosity and imagination, which had previously accumulated in the erstwhile separate aesthetic field. But the desired meeting did not occur, even though the artists did directly join in the organisation of labour and the everyday.

The reasons are, as always, of a geopolitical and economic nature, not any cognitive flaws in the workers or the artists. Specifically, following the Revolution, the First World War, and the subsequent civil war, the Soviet Union was a completely devastated country, with no developed industrial manufacturing, and an overwhelmingly rural population, most of whom were illiterate. Also, the expected breakout of socialist revolutions throughout Western Europe failed to materialise. Faced with extraordinary geopolitical pressures, they had to plunge into a strong industrialisation campaign and retroactively create the proletariat as the carrier of the revolutionary struggle. The

*Taylorov sistem – kao i svi progresi kapitalizma – spaja u sebi rafiniranu bestijalnost buržoaske eksploatacije i niz vrlo dragocjenih naučnih tekovina u analiziranju mehaničkih pokreta pri radu, u otklanjanju suvišnih i nespretnih pokreta, u izradi najpravilnijih metoda rada, u uvođenju najboljih sistema evidencije i kontrole itd. Sovjetska republika mora pošto-poto uzeti iz tekovina nauke i tehnike u toj oblasti sve ono što je vrijedno. Ostvarljivost socijalizma zavisit će baš od naših uspjeha u povezivanju sovjetske organizacije upravljanja s najnovijim progresom kapitalizma. U Rusiji treba organizirati proučavanje i predavanje Taylorovog sistema, njegovo sistematsko ispitivanje i prilagođavanje.*²

Identična organizacija rada i eksploatacija kao na Zapadu, samo uz promijenjenu vlasničku strukturu, poremetila je imaginacijske horizonte po pitanju rada ne samo kod umjetnika na Zapadu,³ nego i kod širih slojeva lijevih pokreta.³ Model i organizacija rada u socijalističkim zemljama kod Zapadnih

2) Vladimir Ilić Lenjin, *Naredni zadaci Sovjetske vlasti, u Izabrana djela Marx – Engels – Lenjin, Knjiga IX, Naprijed, Zagreb, 1963, str. 385.*

3) Potrebno je napomenuti da je u fordističkoj organizaciji rada prepoznat i emancipatorski potencijal. Umjetnici su u njemu prepoznali sredstvo modernizacije u Rusiji, gdje je većina seljačkog puka živjela u predmodernim uvjetima. Njegovo poklapanje s političkom revolucijom priskrbilo mu je status nužnosti.

mode of production was organised on Taylorist principles. Lenin's elaboration of the selection of that industrialisation mode is well known:

*The Taylor system like all capitalist progress, is a combination of the refined brutality of bourgeois exploitation and a number of the greatest scientific achievements in the field of analyzing mechanical motions during work, the elimination of superfluous and awkward motions, the elaboration of correct methods of work, the introduction of the best system of accounting and control, etc. The Soviet Republic must at all costs adopt all that is valuable in the achievements of science and technology in this field. The possibility of building socialism depends exactly upon our success in combining the Soviet power and the Soviet Organization of administration with the up-to-date achievements of capitalism. We must organize in Russia the study and teaching of the Taylor system and systematically try it out and adapt it to our ends.*²

An organisation of labour and exploitation identical to those found in the West, only with an altered property structure, upset the imaginary horizons of labour not only in Western artists,

2) Vladimir Ilić Lenjin, *Naredni zadaci Sovjetske vlasti, in Izabrana djela Marx – Engels – Lenjin, Book IX, Naprijed, Zagreb, 1963, p. 385.*

umjetnika sklonih mijenjanju socijalne funkcije umjetnosti su uzrokovale priklanjanje onoj struji koja je zagovarala likvidaciju institucije umjetnosti kroz estetizaciju svakodnevice, za razliku od druge opcije uključivanja umjetnosti u proizvodni ciklus. Uzrok tome nije bilo samo razočaranje s realno postojećim socijalizmima, već i situacija na Zapadu nakon Drugog svjetskog rata, ekonomski *boom* kejnzijanskog blagostanja, iznimno smanjena nezaposlenost i ogroman rast potrošnje. I tada se umjetnička borba protiv alijenacije preselila u sferu potrošnje. Bilo da je riječ o proizvodnji novih identiteta slijedom povećane potrošnje ili zasićenosti svakodnevice, dotad zaštićene, uplivom marketinga.

Paralelno s nestankom preokupacije umjetnika sa sferom rada javlja se i konsenzualna dijagnoza o kraju političke umjetnosti, to jest o nemoći umjetničke prakse da efektivno djeluje u političkom polju. Ono što je umjetnicima, kuratorima i teoretičarima umjetnosti nedostajalo je politička artikulacija vlastite pozicije i produktivna politička valorizacija umjetnosti. No, onda se pojavila teorija koja im je riješila sve probleme. Svi problemi i popratni primjeri prethodno kratko naznačeni – mjesto rada u inaurguralnoj konstituciji autonomnog umjetničkog polja, rad unutar samog umjetničkog postupka i dvadesetostoljetna ekonomska i politička

but also in wider strata of leftist movements.³ The model and organisation of labour in the socialist countries induced those Western artists who were inclined to a change in the social function of art to join the faction that advocated the liquidation of the institution of art through the aestheticisation of the everyday, as opposed to the other option – that of including art into the production cycle. The reasons included not only their disappointment with the existing real socialisms, but also the situation in the West following the Second World War, the economic boom of the Keynesian welfare state, a remarkable drop in unemployment, and a huge increase in consumption. At that moment, the artistic struggle against alienation moved to the sphere of consumption, whether it concerned the production of new identities through increased consumption, or the saturation of the erstwhile protected everyday with the onslaught of marketing.

Alongside the disappearance of the artists' preoccupation with the sphere of labour, there also emerged the consensual diagnosis of the end of political art, that is, of the inability of art practice effectively to partake in the political field. What artists, curators, and art theorists missed was a political articulation of their own

3) *It should be noted that the Fordist organisation of labour was also recognised for its perceived emancipatory potential. Artists recognised it as a tool of modernisation in Russia, where most of the peasant populace lived in pre-modern conditions. Its coincidence with the political revolution afforded it its status of necessity.*

povijest kroz koju se na različite načine pitanje rada artikuliralo ili zaobilazilo – zadobili su u toj teoriji adekvatan odgovor. Riječ je o teoriji nematerijalnog rada.

⁴Na nekoliko razina ta teorija osigurava umjetnicima priželjkivan okvir za analizu vlastite političke pozicije – postavlja umjetnike na istu ekonomsku razinu kao ostale nematerijalne radnike, funkcioniraju u istom režimu proizvodnje kao i ostali i neposredni su dio eventualnog revolucionarnog subjekta, mnoštva, nakon što su kroz povijest uvijek tražili najadekvatniji pristup i odnos s revolucionarnim pokretima.

Osnovni problem odnosa umjetnika spram teorije nematerijalnog rada je u tome što funkcionira kao identifikacija, a identifikacija uvijek predstavlja simptom. Ono što je simptomatično u ovoj situaciji je subjekt identificiranja – sigurno je nešto krivo s teorijom nematerijalnog rada kao eksplanatornim obrascem za suvremeni kapitalizam i model otpora čim je najlukrativnija u umjetničkom polju i kod kulturnih radnika. Problem nije u političkim deficijentnostima umjetnika i kulturnih radnika kao takvih, već u njihovoj socijalno institucionaliziranoj poziciji. Teorija nematerijalnog rada svoje konture

position and a productive political valorisation of art. But then a new theory emerged, which solved all their problems. All the problems and accompanying examples briefly noted above – the position of labour in the inaugural constitution of the autonomous art field; labour within the artistic procedure itself; and the 20th century economic and political history, through which the issue of labour was variously articulated or sidestepped – received in that theory their adequate answers. The theory in question is that of immaterial labour.⁴ On several levels, that theory secures for artists their desired framework for analysing their own political position – it puts them on the same economic level as other immaterial workers; they get to operate in the same production regime as others and are part of the eventual revolutionary subject, the multitude, after having sought throughout history for the most adequate approach and relation to revolutionary movements.

The basic problem of the artists' relation to the theory of immaterial labour is its functioning as identification, whereas identification always represents a symptom. What is symptomatic in this situation is the identifying subject – there must be something wrong with the theory of immaterial labour as an explanatory method for contemporary capitalism and a model of resistance if it is also the most lucrative theory

4) U uskoj su vezi su i teorije kognitivnog kapitalizma, prekarnosti rada...
TkH časopis za teoriju izvođačkih umjetnosti 37

4) The theories of cognitive capitalism, the precarity of labour, etc. are also closely related here.
TkH Journal for Performing Arts Theory

duguje specifičnoj historijskoj i geopolitičkoj situaciji u kojoj je nastala. Talijanska ljevica krajem 1970-ih i 80-ih pokušala je artikulirati specifičnu situaciju deindustrijalizacije sjeverne Italije i probleme koje je to predstavljalo organiziranom radničkom pokretu. Precizno su definirali nove oblike rada koji se javljaju i pokušavali suvislo osmisliti modele borbe na tim osnovama. Teorijski problemi i nedosljednosti nastaju ekspanzijom tih teorija na globalnom tržištu lijevih ideja i ahistorizacijom njihova izvora i kriterija za uporabljivost. Prvi problem je pretpostavka o kapitalizmu kao evolucijskom sistemu u kojem su postindustrijska organizacija rada i njegov nematerijalni i afektivni karakter neminovna faza koja je sada još statistički nedominantna, ali je hegemonijska, i koja će postepeno obuhvatiti cijeli globalni kapitalistički sistem. Takve postavke sumnjive su već na razini banalne geopolitičke evidencije. Deindustrijalizacija se ne događa kao efekt neminovnog razvoja kapitalizma već je dio jasne klasne agende vladajuće klase zemalja centra. Najmoćnije zemlje poput Njemačke nisu prošle taj proces, za razliku od istočnoevropskih zemalja koje u nedostatku vlastitih proizvodnih kapaciteta funkcioniraju kao otvorena tržišta za evropski finansijski kapital. Da kineski industrijski razvoj i njenu trgovinsku bilancu sa SAD-om ne spominjemo. Također, iz historijske perspektive koju predlaže

in the field of art and most popular with cultural workers. The problem is not any political deficiencies in the artists or cultural workers as such, but their socially institutionalised position. The theory of immaterial labour owes its shape to the specific historical and geopolitical situation in which it emerged. During the late 1970s and '80s, the Italian left tried to articulate the specific situation of the de-industrialising of Northern Italy and the problems that that presented to the organised labour movement there. They precisely defined the new forms of labour that were emerging then and tried rationally to conceptualise models of struggle on those grounds. The theoretical problems and inconsistencies started emerging with the expansion of those theories on the global market of leftist ideas and through the ahistoricisation of their sources and criteria of usability. The first problem was the assumption of capitalism as an evolving system, whereby its post-industrial organisation of labour and its immaterial and affective character are an imminent stage that is as yet statistically un-predominant but is hegemonic and will gradually consume the entire global capitalist system. Such claims seem dubious already at the level of banal geopolitical evidence. The deindustrialisation is happening not as an effect of the inexorable advance of capitalism, but is part of a clear class agenda of the centre countries' ruling classes. The most powerful countries, such as Germany, have not undergone that process,

Giovanni Arrighi⁵, ovaj stadij kapitalizma nije nešto novo, on se javlja ciklički pri kraju određenog akumulacijskog režima kroz povijest koji je uvijek hegemonijsko određen, u ovom historijskom momentu SAD-om, i uvijek se pri kraju ciklusa događa proces financijalizacije. Dakle, ono što je fundamentalno u recentnoj povijesti kapitalizma nije socio-tehnička organizacija rada već proces financijalizacije. Sljedeći problem je pretpostavka o fundamentalnoj determinaciji odnosa kapital – rad industrijskom tvorničkom organizacijom rada i, na osnovu toga, neminovne suštinske promjene tog odnosa danas. Na jednom mjestu u *Kapitalu* sam Marx iznosi gotovo pa preventivnu kritiku na tome zasnovanih teorija:

*Izaberemo li primer izvan oblasti materijalne proizvodnje, onda je neki učitelj proizvođač radnik kad ne radi samo na obrađivanju detinjih glava, nego kad i sam izdaje radi bogaćenja poduzetnika. Ovaj se odnos ni u čemu ne menja time što je kapitalista uložio svoj kapital u fabriku znanja mesto u fabriku kobasica.*⁶

Također, ta pretpostavka vezana je i za dominantnu definiciju radničke klase koja je

5) Giovanni Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century*, Verso, London – Njujork, 2010.

6) Karl Marks, *Kapital*, u *Karl Marks i Fridrih Engels, Dela*, tom 21, Prosveta – Institut za proučavanje radničkog pokreta, Beograd, 1977, str. 448.

unlike Eastern-European countries, which, lacking their production capacities, function as open markets for European financial capital; to say nothing of China's industrial development and its trade surplus with the US. Also, from the historical perspective suggested by Giovanni Arrighi,⁵ this stage of capitalism is nothing new; rather, it appears cyclically, throughout history, at the end of a certain accumulation regime that is always hegemonically determined, at the present historical instance by the US, and, moreover, as the cycle nears its end, a process of financialisation always occurs. Therefore, what is fundamental to the recent history of capitalism is not the socio-technical organisation of labour, but the process of financialisation. Another problem is the assumption of the fundamental determination of the capital-labour relation through the industrial, factory organisation of labour and, consequently, the imminent essential changes to that relation today. There is a place in the *Capital* where Marx himself lays out an almost pre-emptive critique of thus founded theories:

If we may take an example from outside the sphere of production of material objects, a schoolmaster is a productive labourer when, in addition to belabouring the heads of his scholars, he works like a horse to enrich the school proprietor. That the latter has laid out his capital in a teaching factory, instead of in a

5) Giovanni Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century*, Verso, London – New York, 2010.

gotovo kulturalna. Historijska koincidencija najvećih revolucionarnih pomaka i specifičnog stadija industrijske proizvodnje uspostavila je kao prototipa radničke klase *blue collar* muškog radnika. No, kako ističe Richard Seymour na svom blogu *Lenin's Tomb*: „Radnička klasa se nikad nije definirala kao skup posebnih vještina, kao posebni način konzumacije, kao posebni skup vrijednosti, krojačkih tendencija ili okusnih sklonosti“.⁷

Možda politički najpogubniji problem tiče se konsolidiranja ideološkog polja u kojem se rasprava i politička borba oko problema rada vode. Neoliberalna kontrarevolucija i kontraradnička ofenziva začeta s dvama egzemplarnim primjerima slamanja štrajkova – Thatcherin slom štrajka rudara i Reaganov slom štrajka kontrolora leta – za svoj zadatak ima na diskurzivnom nivou, kroz akademski sustav i medijske mreže, sa svom silom stručnjaka depolitizirati polje rada. Događa se poklapanje retorike *managera* s analitičkim radom lijevih teoretičara nematerijalnog rada i nove ekonomije. Bez obzira na neke vrijedne uvide u analizi određenih suvremenih formi rada, izostanak njihove konfliktne relacije s retorikom o novoj ekonomiji, kreativnom radu i *human capital*-u kojom se vladajuće klase samolegitimiraju i pokušavaju zamaskirati

*sausage factory, does not alter the relation.*⁶ Moreover, that assumption is also bound up with the dominant definition of the working class that is almost cultural. The historical coincidence between the greatest revolutionary shifts and a specific stage of industrial production has established the blue-collar male worker as the prototype of the working class. But, as Richard Seymour emphasises on *Lenin's Tomb*, his blog: “The ‘working class’ has never been defined by a particular skill set, a particular kind of consumption, a particular set of values, sartorial tendencies or gustatory propensities”⁷

Perhaps the most pernicious political problem concerns the consolidating of the ideological field, in which the debate and political struggle around the labour problem are being waged. The neoliberal counterrevolution and the anti-working class offensive begun by two exemplary instances of strike suppressing – Thatcher’s suppression of the miners’ strike and Reagan’s suppression of the air traffic controllers’ strike – have, as their task, to depoliticise the field of labour on the discursive plane, through the academic system and media network, and with the full force of the expert community. The managers’ rhetoric is beginning to correspond

⁶ Karl Marks, *Kapital*, in *Karl Marks and Fridrih Engels, Dela*, vol. 21, *Prosveta* – Institut za proučavanje radničkog pokreta, Beograd, 1977, p. 448.

⁷ <http://leninology.blogspot.com/2010/06/working-for-capitalism.html>

⁷ Richard Seymour, „Working for Capitalism“, <http://leninology.blogspot.com/2010/06/working-for-capitalism.html>

klasnu borbu na radnom mjestu predstavlja ozbiljan politički problem za artikulaciju lijeve pozicije u trenutnoj historijskoj situaciji, kad vlade diljem svijeta usvajaju *austerity measures* konsolidirano upravljajući najvećim napadom na radničku klasu još od Drugog svjetskog rata. U seminalnoj studiji o radu u suvremenom kapitalizmu *New Capitalism? Transformations of Work* u kojoj uspješno pokušava na statističkoj razini i kroz ideološku analizu demistificirati predodžbe o novoj ekonomiji, novim formama rada i globalizaciji, Kevin Doogan u zaključnom poglavlju na konkretnom primjeru nedavnog spekulativnog *boom*-a upozorava na naznačeni problem:

*Pri svakom spomenu nove ekonomije ili ekonomije znanja vrijedi se prisjetiti da su to bile buzzwords koje su koristili špekulatori pravdajući masivna investiranja u milijune kilometara optičkih kabela koji sad uglavnom leže neiskorišteni u lokalnim mrežama i na morskom dnu.*⁸

Ovdje su samo grubo naznačeni problemi koje teorija nematerijalnog rada predstavlja analizi suvremenog kapitalizma i organizaciji otpora. Umjetnički rad se može jasno analizirati pristupom koji ta teorija nudi – od proizvoda koji nije materijalan nego predstavlja uslugu, afekt ili atmosferu do nestanka razlike između radnog i neradnog vremena – ali ta

with the analytic work of the leftist theorists of immaterial labour and the new economics. Despite some valuable insights in the analysis of certain contemporary forms of labour, their absence of an adversarial relation to the rhetoric of the new economics, creative labour, and human capital, with which the ruling classes have been legitimising themselves and trying to cover up the class struggle at the workplace, has presented a serious problem to the articulation of the leftist position in the present historical situation, in which governments throughout the world have been imposing austerity measures in what is the biggest consolidated attack on the working class since the Second World War. In the concluding chapter of his seminal study of labour in contemporary capitalism, *New Capitalism? Transformations of Work*, where he successfully tries to demystify conceptions of the new economics, new forms of labour, and globalisation in statistic terms and through ideological analysis, Kevin Doogan warns of the problem indicated above, with reference to the specific case of the recent speculative boom: *Every time mention is made of the new economy and the knowledge economy it is worth remembering that these were the buzz words the speculators used to justify massive investments in millions of miles of fibre optic cable that now lie largely underused in local networks and on the sea bed.*⁸

8) Kevin Doogan, *New Capitalism? The Transformation of Work*, Polity Press, Kembridž VB, 2009, str. 221.

8) Kevin Doogan, *New Capitalism? The Transformations of Work*, Polity Press, Cambridge UK, 2009, p.221.

analiza ne predstavlja moment neposredne politizacije umjetnosti. Ona samo djeluje kao *short-cut* identifikacijsko rješenje za sve probleme odnosa umjetnosti i rada i odnosa umjetnika s radničkom klasom. U trenutku kad se globalno urušava javni sektor i javni resursi privatiziraju, umjetnicima i kulturnim radnicima kao politički produktivna samo-artikulacija preostaje proglašavanje vlastitih praksi javnom potrebom i stvari od javnog interesa te priključivanje u koaliciju šireg fronta otpora brutalnog napada na javni interes i stečena socijalna prava. Umjetnost se može braniti jedino kao demokratska praksa od javnog interesa.

The problems that the theory of immaterial labour presents to the analysis of contemporary capitalism and organisation of resistance are only roughly sketched here. Artistic work may clearly be analysed through the approach that that theory offers – from its product that is not material but represents a service, affect, or atmosphere, through the disappearance of the distinction between working and leisure hours – but that analysis does not represent a moment of an immediate politicisation of art. It merely works as a shortcut identifying solution to all the problems of the relations between art and work and between artists and the working class. At a moment when the public sector is being imploded globally and public resources are being privatised, the only politically productive self-articulation that artists and cultural workers are left with is to proclaim their own practices a public need and a matter of public interest, as well as to join a wider-front coalition of resistance to the brutal attack on public interest and acquired social rights. Art can be defended only as a democratic practice in the public interest.

*Translated from Croatian
by Žarko Cvejić*

Očudjenje utjelovljenja kao koreografska socijalna svijest

Piše Una Bauer

”Trebamo prestati s tom idejom “imanja tijela” i umjesto toga razmišljati o našim tijelima kao o aktivnosti, kao o glagolu, kao o kretanju i procesu postanka. Dokle god ”imamo” i ”posjedujemo” tijelo, uvijek ćemo osjećati kako nas vrijeđa, gazi i oskrvrnjuje jezik, diskurs i reprezentacija.” Tako piše koreograf Mårten Spångberg, sažimajući utopijski odnos suvremene plesne produkcije prema tijelu, u još jednoj manifestaciji vječne borbe plesa s dekartovskim dualizmom. Tradicija mišljenja tijela kao nečega što nam pripada, što posjedujemo, iznajmljujemo, u čemu privremeno boravimo umjesto kao onoga što jesmo, duboko je ukorijenjena u gotovo svim religijskim dogmama, jer na njoj počiva ideja o životu poslije života. Ipak, ideja ”posjedovanja tijela”, nije samo religijski mentalni refleksi, Paradoks utjelovljenja najizraženiji je kod iskustva invaliditeta koje se često doživljava kao iskustvo koje odvaja tijelo od sebstva. Tijelo s invaliditetom je, dakako, utjelovljeno, a opet, kada zahtjevi tijela dođu u sukob sa željenom samo-prezentacijom, osoba naglo postaje svjesna jaza između tijela i sebstva. Iako je žudnja za nadraštanjem udvajanja sebstva i tijela jaka, potrebno je istovremeno suočiti se s time koliko je to udvajanje žilavo i koliko ga je na iskustvenoj razini, na razini tjelesne patnje i (prirodne!) neugode teško u potpunosti zaniijekati.

Estrangement of embodiment as choreographic social consciousness

By Una Bauer

”We should stop the stupid idea of having a body and instead consider our bodies as activity, as verbs, as movement and becoming. As long as we “have” and “possess” a body we are always gonna feel violated by language, discourse and the rest of representation”, writes a choreographer Mårten Spångberg, summarizing the utopian relationship of contemporary dance with the body, in yet another manifestation of the eternal struggle of dance with descartian dualism. The tradition of thinking about the body as something which belongs to us, which we own, or rent, something which we temporarily inhabit, is deeply imbedded in all religious dogmas, because the idea of life after life is based on it. However, the idea of ”body as property” isn’t just a religious mental reflex. The paradox of embodiment is most pronounced with disability, often perceived as an experience which separates the body from the self. Disable body, is, of course, embodied, and yet, when the demands of the body conflict with the desired self-representation, one immediately becomes aware of the gap between the body and the self. Although the desire for a surpassing of the dualism between the body and the self is strong, it is necessary to confront the fact that this dualism is resistant, and that it is, on an experiential level of physical suffering and (natural!) discomfort, difficult to disregard it completely. However, what especially strengthens the idea of body as property are

Međutim, ono što posebno osnažuje ideju tijela kao vlasništva kapitalistički su procesi komodifikacije. Tradicija borbe protiv doslovne komodifikacije tijela puna je jezivih paradoksa: Margaret Jean Radin u svom članku "Tržišna neotuđivost" opisuje problem koji antikomodifikacijska pozicija predstavlja za onoga koji se nalazi u situaciji krajnjeg siromaštva: ako osoba na samom rubu egzistencije proda dio svoga tijela, npr. bubreg, kako bi preživjela, ona svoje tijelo tretira kao robu za prodaju – komodificira ga. S druge strane, ako ga ne proda, umrijet će od gladi.

Marjana Krajač u opisu svoje predstave *Kratka fantazija o ponovnom uspostavljanju vlasništva nad tijelom* koji zvuči poput manifesta, provocira iskazom "Moje tijelo nije u mojem vlasništvu." Ta je rečenica zavodljivo višeznačna: izvučena iz konteksta, mogao ju je izgovoriti kako svećenik (uz nastavak "Moje tijelo pripada Bogu"), tako i prostitutka čije je tijelo dostupno uz novčanu naknadu ali i filozof opisujući svoju ideju "življenog tijela" (Sartre): "Ja jesam svoje tijelo". Ipak, Marjani Krajač je ta rečenica uvod u nešto drugo, u fukoovsku ideju tijela kao pozicije na kojoj se križaju mehanizmi (institucionalne) moći, kao nečeg što je proizvod društvenog poretka, rezultat diskurzivnih aktivnosti, a ne samo prirodna biološka datost.

capitalist processes of commodification. The history of the struggle against the commodification of body is full of creepy paradoxes: in her article "Market inalienability", Margaret Jean Radin describes a problem that anti-commodification position poses to the desperately poor: if a poor person sells a part of his body, his kidney for instance, in order to survive, he or she treats his or her body as a commodity. On the other hand, if they don't do so, they will starve to death.

In the text accompanying the presentation of her performance *Short Fantasy About Reclaiming The Ownership Over My Own Body*, which sounds like a manifesto, Marjana Krajač claims provocatively: "I do not own my body". This sentence is seductive: taken out of context, it could have been spoken by a priest (followed by "My body belongs to God"), or by a prostitute whose body is available for a price, but also by a philosopher describing his idea of the "lived body" (Sartre): "I am my body." And yet, for Marjana Krajač, this sentence is an introduction to something else, to a foucauldian idea of the body as a position where the mechanisms of (institutional) power are deployed, as something which is a product of the social order, of discursive activities, rather than something naturally and biologically unquestionable.

In her solo, Marjana Krajač does not rethink some general theoretical body, some humanistic

Marjana Krajač u svome solu ne misli samo na neko opće teorijsko tijelo humanističke apstrakcije, ona misli prvenstveno na konkretna tijela koja su pokušavala spriječiti (ilegalno) otimanje javnog prostora, na tijela ispred bagera, u metalnim kontejnerima, tijela svih onih koji su usred noći trčali u Varšavsku na pozive i sms poruke Prava na grad. I onih čije su ruke ostale zaglavljene u cijevima kojima su se povezali kada ih je policija vukla sa kontejnera. Varšavska jest mjesecima bila vježbalište za različite tehnike "organa reda" ali i privatnih zaštitarskih kuća kojima su se neposlušna tijela građanskog otpora pokušavala disciplinirati i kontrolirati. Policija je disciplinirala tijela eko-aktivista, slučajnih prolaznika i simpatizera Prava na grad, ali i učila kako to činiti, vježbala na njima – kako ih skinuti s kontejnera da se ne polome, kako ih izvući iz kontejnera, opet da se ne polome, kako ih izgurati da kamioni mogu prolaziti, kako ih kontrolirati da ne uteknu i ne pojave se na nezgodnom mjestu, kako im zabraniti prolaz, kako ih natjerati da ustanu s poda, kako ih odvezati s drveta, kako ih najučinkovitije ubaciti u maricu, a izbjeći prigovorima civilne scene i negativnim natpisima koji bi narušili medijsku sliku MUP-a. Strateški gledano, za policiju su osobe na prosvjedima prvenstveno fizičkosti koje je potrebno ukloniti, razmjestiti, pomaknuti, podići i odnijeti. Razni procesi

abstraction, but primarily those concrete bodies which have attempted to prevent the theft of the public space. She thinks of the bodies in front of trucks, inside metal containers, bodies of all those who were running towards Varšavska in the middle of the night responding to calls and text messages from the initiative The Right to the City. And those whose arms were stuck when they were cuffed to each other and the police dragged them off the containers. Varšavska street was for months a field training exercise for the police, but also for private security companies paid to control and discipline disorderly bodies of civil disobedience. The police disciplined the bodies of eco-activists, passers-by, and supporters of the initiative The Right to the City, but was at the same time learning how to do that, practicing on their bodies – how to take them off the container and not to hurt them more than necessary, how to drag them out of the container without breaking their bones, how to push them aside so that trucks with building materials can drive through, how to control them so that they don't run away and appear in the wrong place, how to stop them from passing through, how to make them get up if they are sitting down, how to untie them from the tree, how to mount them into the police van, and yet not offer any justification for the protesters to complain that they have been mistreated, how to avoid the negative image of the Ministry of Internal Affairs in the media. Strategically speaking, for the police the

kontrola ljudske populacije djelatni su svakodnevno, i oni omogućuju funkcioniranje društvene zajednice, a njihovo je operiranje upravljano političkim sredstvima: organizacijom radne snage, menadžmentom ljudskih resursa ili onim dnevnim oblicima kontrole koje (najčešće) ne doživljavamo represivnima, kao što je regulacija prometa. Međutim u izuzetnim situacijama kao što je Varšavska, mehanizmi koji su inače automatizirani i nevidljivi (i nužni), dolaze u prvi plan, izravno se razotkrivaju i osvještavaju kao nešto što je direktno *fizički* represivno, a to je problematično zato jer je istovremeno i *nepravedno* odnosno promašuje svoju svrhu, jer, za razliku od regulacije prometa, hapšenja dilera teškim drogama ili odbjeglog premijera, *nije* u javnom interesu.

Jedini scenografski element sola Marjane Krajač velika je fotografija koju oni koji su pratili ili sudjelovali u protestima protiv izgradnje podzemne garaže s ulazom iz Varšavske odmah prepoznaju. Policajci s pendrecima i šljemovima gledaju negdje preko kamere, zajedno s nekoliko novinara i izvjestitelja, promatraju spektakl koji su sami učinili takvim. U donjem desnom kutu je ostatak srušene ograde ispod koje se noćima kampiralo kako bi se spriječila ilegalna izgradnja. Na tri mjesta vidi se zaštitni znak jedne banke, i natpis koji se uistinu može čitati samo ironično: "Mirovina mi je uvijek

protesters are primarily physical obstacles that need to be removed, dispersed, transferred, displaced and carried away. Various processes of control of human population are operational on a daily basis, and they enable the functioning of the society. Their regulation is governed by political means: organisation of labour force, management of human resources or other daily forms of social control which we normally do not experience as repressive, such as traffic regulation. However, in special situations such as Varšavska street, those mechanisms which are normally automatized and invisible (and necessary) are being performed out in the open, for everyone to see and to become aware of them. They are displayed as something which is directly physically oppressive and the main reason why this is problematic is because it is also *unjust* at the same time. Unlike traffic regulation, drug dealers' arrest or the hunt for the former prime minister who has escaped, this isn't in the public interest.

The only object on stage in Marjana Krajač's solo is a large photo, easily recognizable for all those who took part in the protests against the building of the entrance to the shopping mall garage in Varšavska street. Police officers wearing helmets and carrying batons are standing straight, staring at something behind the camera (or at Marjana Krajač while she performs her solo), together with several journalists and reporters, observing the

prvog u mjesecu”, kao da će mlada generacija koja je mjesecima kampirala u Varšavskoj uopće imati mirovinu, zahvaljujući eroziji društvene svijesti i ideje javnog dobra u korist kulture opsesivnog konzumerizma, čiji je simbol upravo HOTO grupa i njeni radovi na Cvjetnom trgu i u Varšavskoj. U tom smislu je *Kratka fantazija o ponovnom uspostavljanju vlasništva nad tijelom* svojevrsan negativ, konceptualni pandan jednog drugog rada Marjane Krajač, *The Store* u kojem se kupovina tematizira kao izvedbena aktivnost, kao izvedba po sebi. Krajačeva ne moralizira oko kupovine i užitka u lijepim stvarima, kao što u krajnjoj liniji, ne moralizira ni oko uloge policije u suzbijanju prosvjeda, već tematizira uvjete pod kojima se taj užitak u lijepim stvarima ostvaruje, odnosno, uvjete pod kojima policijska represija djeluje i njenu opravdanost.

Svo to osvještavanje tjelesnosti potaknuto policijskim vježbama kontrole, Marjana utjelovljuje u svom solu. Tijelo funkcionira kao interface, kao medij koji je uvjet bilo kakve percepcije, percepcije uopće. Tijelo kao jamac postojanja svijeta. Krajačeva kao da odista iznova *ulazi* u svoje tijelo, ispitujući mu mogućnosti, pokušavajući ga pokrenuti i aktivirati, ali tako da se zadrži distanca između nje (gdje god ona bila), i njenog tijela (što god ono bilo). To je šizofrena pozicija, iznimno zanimljiva za gledanje. Veliki je

spectacle which they are responsible for. At the bottom right corner of the photo, we can see the remains of the fence that was taken down by the protesters. The protesters slept day and night under this fence, guarding the place, in order to prevent the illegal building. We can also see the trademark of a bank, and a slogan which can be read only ironically: “My pension always arrives on the first day of the month!”, as if the younger generation which slept for months on the asphalt of Varšavska street will ever receive their pensions, thanks to the erosion of social consciousness and the idea of public good in exchange for the culture of obsessive consumerism, symbolized precisely by HOTO group and the building of Cvjetni shopping mall. In that sense, *Short Fantasy About Reclaiming The Ownership Over My Own Body* is a certain *negative*, a conceptual pair of another work by Marjana Krajač, *The Store*, where shopping is thematized as performance. Krajač does not moralize on shopping and the pleasure of owning beautiful things, in the same way that she does not moralize on the role of police in these protests, but she problematizes the conditions that enable the pleasure of shopping, or those that police repression is based on and the question of its (legal) justification and legitimation.

In here solo, Marjana embodies this rethinking of physicality induced by police exercises of control. The body functions as an interface, as

izazov za plesača zaboraviti odnosno od-znati mehaniku vlastite tjelesne virtuočnosti kako bi se tijelo ponovo upoznalo i iznova osjetilo, kako bi se utjelovio taj trenutak očuđenja. I zato je virtuočnost Marjane Krajač izokrenuta virtuočnost ili dvostruka virtuočnost – jer gdje je plesač više udomljen nego u svome tijelu, što je plesaču više njegovo od njegovog tijela – i koliko vještine treba da bi se ponovo umaklo toj žrtvi virtuočnosti u koju se godinama ulagalo, koja je postala nečijim primarnim izvorom sredstva za život. A upravo je to odmicanje od virtuočnosti samo po sebi iznimno virtuožno.

Marjana Krajač pokušava ponovo zauzeti to tijelo koje više ne pripada njoj (kao što ni dio Varšavske više ne pripada građanima za slobodno korištenje) jer nad njime divljaju različiti procesi političkog i ekonomskog rastjelovljenja koji su u suprotnosti s javnim interesom. I u tom pokušaju, umjesto poslušnog tijela, tijela koje ne primjećujemo, kojeg uzimamo zdravo za gotovo, isplivava tijelo koje se suprotstavlja naredbama, koje frustrira i sabotira neku radnju. Neposlušno tijelo. Umjesto da se divimo njegovom skladu, to nam se tijelo ukazuje kao stalna neugodna prisutnost koja uvijek negdje grebe po rubovima svijesti. To je tijelo buntovno, ono podstiče ali i prijeti našem osjećaju dostojanstva i vrijednosti, istovremeno nam je na ponos i na sramotu, kao u sceni kada četiri

a medium which conditions perception as such. The body as the condition of the existence of the world. Krajač seems to re-enter her body again, questioning its possibilities, trying to move her body and to activate it, but so that she keeps the distance between her (wherever she is) and her body (whatever it is). That is a schizophrenic position, exceptionally interesting to watch. It is very challenging for the dancer to forget, or rather to un-know the mechanics of their physical virtuosity in order to meet and feel the body again, in order to embody the moment of estrangement. That is why the virtuosity of Marjana Krajač is an upside down virtuosity or a double virtuosity – because where is a dancer more at home than in his body, what is more “his” than his body – and how difficult is it to escape the sacrifice of virtuosity developed over the years, which became someone’s primary source of income. And precisely this re-evaluation of virtuosity is very virtuosic.

Krajač attempts to repossess the body which does not belong to her anymore (similar to the way a part of Varšavska street does not belong to the citizens and is not as a public space any more) because various processes of political and economic disembodiment, which are opposing the public interest, are violating it. And in this attempt, instead of an obedient body, a body which we don’t even notice, which we take for granted, a rebellious body re-surfaces, the body which opposes the orders, which frustrates and

policajca u kacicama ubacuju prosvjednika u maricu vukući ga za ruke i noge, dok mu gaće klize s bokova otkrivajući blještavo bijelo dupe.

Ali ono što je važno iznova naglasiti jest da koreografsko tijelo Marjane Krajač nije privatno, individualno tijelo, niti se ona bori za SVOJE tijelo, koje se opire društvenim premrežavanjima i zagovara apsolutnu kontrolu nad svojom posebnošću i idiosinkrazijama. Tijelo Marjane Krajač nije tijelo fokusirano na realizaciju samo svoje (koreografske i plesачke) posebnosti, već na problematiziranje nečega do čega nam je svima *zajednički* stalo, ili se bar možemo nadati da jest.

sabotages an action. A disobedient body. Instead of admiring its harmony, this body appears as a continuous discomforting presence always lurking from the corners of our consciousness. This body is rebellious, it incites our pride, but also threatens our sense of dignity and self-worth, making us proud and embarrassing us at the same time, as when four policeman are dragging the protester into the police van, and his knickers slip over his hips, displaying his shiny white ass.

But what is important to emphasize is that the choreographic body of Marjana Krajač isn't a private body, neither does she fight solely for HER OWN body, resistant to social networks and arguing for an absolute control of its idiosyncrasies. The body of Marjana Krajač isn't focused on the realization of her own (choreographic and dancing) singularity, but on the problematization of something we all care about *together*.

Biographies

MARJANA KRAJAČ is choreographer and author. She graduated from State School for Contemporary Dance “Ana Maletić” in Zagreb, Academy of Performing Arts in Berlin and has also studied theology and religion science at Humboldt Universität zu Berlin. She worked with Grupe Dunes in Marseille, collaborated with Mårten Spångberg and Meg Stuart in projects *Choreographers' Venture - The Adventure* and *Everyday Heroes/Extern Sources*.

She is a past recipient of the DanceWEB scholarship and Mobile Academy Berlin scholarship with master classes of Chen Shi Zheng, Jossi Wieler and Ulrike Haage where she specializes in opera material research. Her textual works had been published in New York's *Movement Research Performance Journal*, Croatian journal for dance *Kretanja*, performing arts journal *Frakcija*, and her latest publishing project THE BOOK can be found online at <http://thebook.sodaberg.hr>. In 2009 her project THE STORE was nominated for T-HT Award of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Zagreb.

Author of 11 full-evening works, her choreographic work reaches to limitless formats always stretching the notion of what choreographic practice, as well as what art as such, can and dare to propose as aesthetic and cultural statement. She worked for and with numerous regional and international venues and festivals, and in 2008 her choreographic

work „Ariadne on Naxos“ was selected for *Enhanced danceWEB Europe Contemporary Dance Coproduction Programme, Vienna*. She lives and works in Zagreb where she founded collaborative SODABERG.

MARKO KOSTANIĆ is dramaturge currently at Academy of Dramatic Art, University of Zagreb. He published numerous reviews referring to the theatre activity concerning performances, books and theory in Croatian magazines *Zarez* and *Frakcija*, in performing arts magazine *tanzjournal* and on the 3rd Programme of Croatian Radio. His dramaturgical activity reaches from contemporary dance to research projects (“Forensics and Fugue for the Folder” at the Conference Performance Studies International#15, “Simple Life” for Festival of Dance and Non-verbal Theatre in Sanvincenti, “Work Every Day” for Tanzfabrik Berlin/ Zagreb Dance Center). In the international project *What to Perform? What to Affirm?* (which is a joint project by Centre For Drama Art (Zagreb), National Dance Centre (Bucharest), Maska (Ljubljana), Tanzquartier (Vienna) and Allianz Kulturstiftung) he organized the symposium “Cinematic modes of choreography”.

He is a member of *Frakcija*'s editorial board currently editing an issue on the work of art in the age of austerity and also this year he is as

a member of Centre for Drama Art organizing a series of lectures and discussions on the problems of valorization methodologies in arts and politics. He is also engaged as political activists and writes commentaries on current political and economic situation and analytical texts on political theory and strategy for the left.

Dr **UNA BAUER** wrote her thesis on the concept of the neutral in the works of Jérôme Bel, Thomas Lehmen, Raimund Hoghe and BADco. She was a PhD student in Dance and Performance at Queen Mary, University of London, where she also taught three courses: London, Culture, Performance; Dance Theatre and Director's Theatre. Her research was fully funded by the Vice Chancellor of the University of London. She graduated in Comparative Literature and Philosophy from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia. Her theatre and dance reviews, analysis and other types of texts have been published in various Croatian, Slovenian, Italian and UK journals, magazines, newspapers, web portals, and broadcasted on radio programs. She was the dramaturge of and performed in D.B. Indoš's *Wolf Man* and co-choreographed and performed in Group Gravity's *raster/koža/val*. Together with Thomas Lehmen, she held a performance workshop in the framework of Schwere Reiter (2008) in Munich. She was

a co-ordinator of PSi15 in Zagreb and the co-ordinator of PSi15 follow-up in Rijeka. Together with Marin Blažević, she edited PSi15 DVD for Performance Research. She was the editorial assistant of *Contemporary Theatre Review* (Routledge) from 2006 till 2009. She is on the editorial board of performing arts journal *Fracija* and cultural magazine *Gordogan*. She translated *Month Python and Philosophy* (2008) and parts of *Quentin Tarantino and Philosophy* (2010) to Croatian.

Credits

Concept, choreography and performance: Marjana Krajač

Photo: Gordana Obradović-Dragišić

Dramatugical support: Marko Kostanić

Realized and supported by: Ministry of Culture of Republic Croatia, City Office for Culture Zagreb, Croatian Institute for Movement and Dance, Zagreb Dance Center, Danceweek Festival, Teatro Viriato Viseu Portugal, RE.AL Lisbon in the frame of W-Est_Where Programme, and Uferstudios/Tanzfabrik Berlin.

Many thanks to: João Fiadeiro, Petra Zanki and libela.org

www.sodaberg.hr



"Mirovina mi je uvijek prvog u mjesecu!"

Baka

Prijedi i ti na VeBe za tebe!

Tek

UŠTE

Bankomat