divanik

Razgovori o medijskoj umetnosti, kulturi i društvu
Conversations and interviews about media art, culture and society

divanik
Razgovori i intervjui o medijskoj umetnosti, kulturi i društvu
Conversations and interviews about media art, culture and society

divanik

Razgovori o medijskoj umetnosti, kulturi i društvu
Conversations and interviews about media art, culture and society

kuda.read

Hert Lovink,
Amsterdam

Raks medija
kolektiv /Sarai

Saskia Sasen,
Čikago

Markus Nojsteter,
Johanesburg

Biro detud,
Pariz

Marina Gržinić,
Ljubljana

Sindi Kon,
San Francisko

Stiv Kurc,
Bafalo

divanik: Sadržaj / Content

divanik
Razgovori o medijskoj umetnosti, kulturi i društvu

Pred nama je zbirka intervjua, vođenih u periodu od 2001. do 2004. godine, koja predstavlja intersekciju istraživanja u domenu novih tehnologija, kulture i društva. U ovim intervjuima predstavljena je mreža ljudi i organizacija, koji čine jedan deo scene savremene medijske umetnosti i teorije.

Centar kuda.org je pratio fenomene koji u sebi sadrže interdisciplinarni i intermedijalni karakter, pozivajući značajne protagoniste medijske umetnosti i teorije, s namerom da lokalnoj publici i umetničkoj sceni pruži uvid u dešavanja na ovom polju.

Istraživanje medija je istorija istraživanja komunikacije, a komunikacija danas je bioproizvod informatičkog doba, razmena vrednosti u kapitalističkom koordinatnom sistemu u kome se koncepti i ideje tretiraju kao značenjske robe i proizvodi. S druge strane, komunikacija je i alat kojim se taj koordinatni sistem menja.

Kao komunikacijska praksa, fenomen intervjua je imanentan Internet kulturi. Intervju predstavlja sažet oblik komunikacije i korisno sredstvo u naučnom radu kao metatekst koji prati složenija teorijska ili umetnička dela. U intervjuu, autori iznose kontekste u kojima su radili, svoje poglede na svet, a neposredna komunikacija putem konkretnih pitanja (i odgovora) predstavlja energetski potencijal izražen u realnom vremenu. To je i prilika da se određene teme analiziraju i strukturiraju u obliku koji se ne bi mogao pojaviti u teorijskim i umetničkim delima. Intervju je sublimiranje različitih aspekata, preklapanje, a svojom interdisciplinarnošću, u datom trenutku, predstavlja jedinstveni sistem razmišljanja.

Razvoj informacijskih i komunikacijskih tehnologija je doneo i novu društvenu ontologiju koja se manifestuje na društvenom, političkom i kulturnom planu. Instancijacija istorije, brzina i kumulacija tehnološkog razvoja uslovljavaju i trenutno reagovanje i kritičku analizu.

Cilj ovih intervjua je da se određeni umetnički i društveno-politički fenomeni kritički analiziraju i predstave širokoj javnosti. U izdanjima „kuda.read"-a ukazuje se na referentni sistem koji je u okviru novih medija i kulture, proširen od marginalnih društvenih praksi do akademskih teorija i naučnih istraživanja.

kuda.org, 2004

Kraj i početak kreativne upotrebe tehnologija

Intervju sa Hertom Lovinkom, Amsterdam

Pitanje: Da li misliš da se u umetničkoj produkciji dešava promena, posebno danas, kada imamo sve veću rasprostranjenost i lakši pristup komunikacionim tehnologijama u okviru novih društveno-ekonomskih odnosa?

Odgovor: Ako posmatramo poziciju umetnosti novih medija, mislim da smo u protekloj dekadi bili svedoci mnogih promena. Ranih devedesetih umetnici su još uvek imali avangardnu ulogu, ili ih je većina ljudi tako doživljavala gledajući ih kako eksperimentišu sa tehnologijom koja nije bila široko rasprostranjena u društvu. Možda isto važi i za akademsku strukturu. Postojala je izvesna ekslukzivnost u korišćenju tehnologije. Nije svako imao kompjuter kod kuće. Tada su se umetnici koji su radili sa tehnologijom na neki način možda osećali privilegovanim. Ovo se dramatično promenilo, posebno devedesetih. Rasprostranjenija upotreba tehnologije započela je još osamdesetih. Prisetimo se samo VHS tehnologije ili pak uspona satelitske tehnologije. Međutim, naglim razvojem personalnih računara, Interneta i rasprostranjenim korišćenjem multimedijalnih uređaja, uočen je i ogroman pomak u demokratizaciji tehnologije. Ovo na duže staze znači da ćemo za deset ili dvadeset godina morati redefinisati ovu promenu pozicije umetnosti. Umetnici više nisu u povlašćenom položaju kada je reč o korišćenju tehnologije i u tom smislu umetnik je samo jedan od mnogih igrača. Stavljen je izuzetno jak akcenat na dizajn u tehnologiji, a inžinjeri još uvek igraju veoma važnu ulogu. Mislim da se može videti pomak ka sve jasnijem kritičkom razmišljanju o ulozi tehnologije tako da umetnik više nema osećaj da je, na neki način, prvi korisnik koji treba da istraži granice tehnologije. Mnogi danas mogu kupiti video opremu čija cena dramatično opada. Ovo takođe znači da se i u okviru umetnosti novih medija menja pristup i da ona sve više ima kritički pristup tome.

P: Jedan si od osnivača Nettime mejling liste. Kako danas, nakon sedam godina, vidiš njena dostignuća?

O: Nettime mejling lista je pokret koji je započet 1995. i koji se desio u veoma posebnom trenutku u vremenu, na samom vrhuncu Internet eksplozije kada se Internet „preselio" iz SAD u Evropu i kada se počeo širiti planetom veoma ubrzano. Nettime započet je kao zajednica i raskrsnica različitih kritičkih praksi umetnika, aktivista, dizajnera, programera – ljudi koji su radili sa novim medijima u okviru novonastajuće industrije novih medija. Naravno, u sve je bio upleten i akademski kadar, teoretičari i kritičari, ali to nikad nije bila samo čista teorija, nikad samo akademska teorija. Kritička praksa bila je široko rasprostranjena. Sada, sedam godina kasnije, Nettime je postala višejezična lista. Pre svega, zastupljeno je šest ili sedam jezika što znači da engleski nije više jedini jezik. Poslednji jezici koji su dodati listi su japanski i kineski, što ukazuje na usmeravanje fokusa ka Aziji, ali takođe i španski i portugalski jezik, tako da možemo videti rast u različitim pravcima. U to vreme akcenat smo stavljali na Istočnu Evropu, ali smo vrlo dobro znali da moramo uključiti i druge kontinente. Net-

time zajednica nije imala eksponencijalan rast. Sve je počelo sa nekoliko stotina ljudi, a sada ih ima oko tri hiljade. To nije tako velika stopa rasta. Ono što zaista možemo uočiti to je da je tokom trajanja dotkom (dot.com) eksplozije kasnih devedesetih, celokupna kritička Internet praksa morala biti iznova iscrtana. To se zaista nije desilo kao odbrambeni potez, ali je sve svakako dospelo u konfuzno stanje u kom je Internet postao enormno popularno poslovno okruženje i naš pristup nije bio odgovarajući, prosto zbog brzine i silovitosti promena. Još tada se moglo videti da smo sve više bili primorani da odgovorimo razvoju, te je postajalo sve teže za kritičku praksu da inicira novi pravac. Mislim da je to jedna od dugoročnijih promena koju mogu da uočim.

P: Da li misliš da su ekonomska stabilnost i blagostanje jedne države u pogledu razvijenosti i implementiranosti informacionih i komunikacionih tehnologija neophodni preduslovi za pojavu i razvoj kritičke kulture novih medija?

O: U većini slučajeva, u bogatim zemljama gde je dosta rasprostranjena upotreba Interneta, to ne znači da je tamo automatski razvijena i kultura novih medija ili kritička praksa. To obično ne funkcioniše na taj način. Posle SAD, druga zemlja po broju korisnika Interneta je Kina, ali tamo se apsolutno ništa ne dešava po pitanju razvoja kulture novih medija. Možemo uzeti primer Japana, gde postoje milioni i milioni korisnika, ali gde je kritički osvrt na mogući uticaj ovih tehnologija veoma ograničen. Apsolutne cifre nam ne govore mnogo. Ako pogledamo Istočnu Evropu ili neke zemlje u Aziji, posebno Indiju, ako posmatramo specifične kulture, pitamo se zbog čega su one tako zanimljive? To nije zbog toga što u njima postoje ogromne IT industrije i zbog toga što cela populacija ima pristup Internetu. To je više zbog toga što postoji ogromna pokretačka snaga među mladim ljudima koji kritički razmišljaju i imaju veoma sofisticiran vizuelni vokabular koji je zajednički imenitelj za širu zajednicu. Postoji kritičko razumevanje važnosti kulture, uloge kulture u celom umreženom društvu ili usponu i razvoju tehnologije. Mislim da je to bitna stvar. Susrešćete se sa tom vrstom svesti na raznim mestima. Možete je naći u Brazilu ili pak u Indiji. U Nju Delhiju postoji centar koji se zove „Sarai" – prvi centar za nove medije u Indiji, otvoren 2001. Oni su već završili velik broj projekata, a akcenat stavljaju na „Open Source" i „Free Software". Oni razvijaju program koji stavlja akcenat na lokalni jezik, Hindi, kojim govori milioni ljudi. To je jezik koji je iz nekog razloga virtuelno odsutan na samom Internetu. Indijci su ovim započeli veoma ambiciozan razvoja kritičkog diskursa o novim medijima u svom regionu.

P: Možeš li nam reći nešto više o tome šta se desilo sa Internet krajolikom nakon sloma dotkom manije?

O: U vreme dotkom eksplozije velik broj kompanija pokušao je da zaradi novac koristeći www (World Wide Web). Pokrenute su Internet stranice za elektronsku trgovinu (e-commerce), u nadi da će potrošači posećivati njihove prezentacije, a možda i kupiti nešto ostavljajući im broj svoje kreditne kartice, ili da će možda posetiti sajt i nakon

toga otići u kupovinu. Ovo je, nažalost, ono na šta većina ljudi danas pomisli kada se spomene Internet. Naravno, Internet nije bio dizajniran kao tržni centar. Kada je pravljen, prvenstveno je bio vođen idejom da se na njemu može doći do informacija ili da pak služi kao neka vrsta arhive. Veoma bogata i raznolika svetska biblioteka, što je možda više bila ideja njegovih osnivača, omogućava razmenu podataka i postavljanje različitih vrsta materijala na Internet. O ovom materijalu se onda moglo raspravljati sa kolegama ili širom publikom. Nakon sloma dotkom-a, pojavio se novi talas Internet aplikacija i mogućnosti. Pre svega, uočavamo rast tzv. weblog-a ili blog-a što je interaktivnija verzija web stranica na kojima se ljudima prezentuju informacije. Za razliku od homepage, weblog dopušta svim korisnicima slanje komentara, doprinoseći tako unosu informacija na sajt. On upošljava softver jednostavan za korišćenje tako da korisnici koji posećuju sajt mogu odmah reagovati i doprineti sadržaju sajta nečim svojim. Ovo je bila velika kulturna promena u odnosu na vreme dotkom-a gde su se web stranice koristile za promociju sadržaja i ideja. U revoluciji koja se trenutno dešava, može se videti da su sami Internet korisnici mnogo više uključeni. Ovo se takođe odražava na jedan drugi razvoj, na tzv. peer-to-peer mreže (mreže koje služe za razmenu podataka, a koje se sastoje od računara koji nisu u međusobnom hijerarhijskom odnosu). Napster je najpoznatiji od svih, ali ih sada ima i mnogo više. Iako je Napster zatvoren, peer-to-peer mreže kao što su Kazaa i neke druge, neverovatno su popularne, posebno kada se radi o razmeni mp3 i mpg fajlova. Sa druge strane, ljudi se sve više interesuju i za razmenu teksta. U mojoj sferi rada ljudi počinju sa razmenom programa univerzitetskih kurseva razmišljajući: „Zašto ne bismo ovu informaciju podelili, zašto ovakve stvari takođe ne bismo podelili sa drugima". Univerziteti kažu: „Postavite sve kurseve na mrežu!". Vi sada praktično možete razmenjivati sve postojeće kurseve u digitalnom formatu. U ovakvim slučajevima ne bi trebalo da mislimo samo na Varner Bros (Warner Bros.) i Diznija (Disney) i gomilu zabrana koje ih okružuju. Peer-to-peer mreže i razmena podataka putem njih veoma je bogata i raznolika aktivnost. Ne radi se samo o aspektu kršenja kopirajta, mada je to možda i najčešće pominjan aspekt, iako to ni u kom slučaju nije jedini način razmene. Ovo bi takođe moglo da znači da će peer-to-peer mreže imati budućnost i pored pitanja prava intelektualne svojine. Lično, mislim da su sajtovi kao Napster i Kazaa najmanje interesantni iz prostog razloga što nivo onih koji učestvuju u razmeni tako što samo uzimaju ono što im treba i onih koji doprinose mreži nije jednak. Nažalost, mnogo ljudi je dolazilo do informacija preko Napstera, ali je malo njih doprinosilo mreži. Mislim da će u bliskoj budućnosti peer-to-peer mreže preživeti samo ako njihove manje verzije naprave ovaj balans. Uzimati podatke, ali isto tako i doprinositi mreži – mislim da je to mnogo zanimljiviji fenomen.

Još od ranih devedesetih, videli smo uspon „Free Software"-a. Tokom dotkom perioda postojala je neka vrsta nesretne unutrašnje borbe u toj zajednici. Postojala je podela između onih koji su bili za „Free Software", i onih koji su bili za malo komercijalniji pristup koji se zove „Open Source". Zbog toga koristimo oba termina, koji za autsaj-

dere znače isto, ali stavljaju različit akcenat kada se radi o licenciranju proizvodnje softvera. Ovo licenciranje je možda previše za insajdere, ali princip je isti. Velik broj kompanija preživeo je dotkom slom. Mislim da jednostavno nisu bile dovoljno velike da bi doživele slom. Mi smo imali sreću što za nas fenomen „Free Software" nije bio tako velik krajem devedesetih. Velik broj inicijativa je preživeo nakon što je ogromna popularnost Interneta splasnula. Kompanije i individualci koji su bili upleteni u sve to otvoreniji su prema ideji i principima „Free Software" i „Open Source"-a. Takođe, mislim da ovakav način razvoja ima svetlu budućnost u sadašnjem vremenu.

P: Da li misliš da u Internet zajednicama dolazi do promene u njihovoj ulozi „alternativnog" sredstva za borbu? Postoji li uopšte neki indikator da Internet postaje šira socijalna kategorija?

O: Veoma je interesantno videti šta se dogodilo kulturi mejling lista, a posebno gubitku nevinosti unutar same zajednice. Saznanje da razmena informacija nije baš tako nevina radnja, i da dovodi do ozbiljnog razmimoilaženja u mišljenju. Šta to znači? Šta to znači u okruženju koje postaje sve više neprijateljski raspoloženo? U proteklih deset godina bili smo svedoci povećanja broja virtuelnih zajednica. Ali, većina njih bazirana je na bezuslovnom konsenzusu unutar grupe. Svi su bili za izvor otvorenog kanala, razmenu informacija, dijalog, itd. Nismo morali da se slažemo sa tim, ali je svakako postojao racionalan diskurs i u proteklih nekoliko godina videli smo da je ova ideja vrlo brzo propala i da mnogi koji su se uključili jednostavno ne dele ovu vrstu naivnog, skoro naučnog modela konsenzusa. Videli smo porast tenzije na mreži, a takođe smo videli i da velik broj umetnika počinje da koristi metode informacijskog rata, ne samo protiv velikih korporacija, ili pak države, već uglavnom za međusobne bitke. Sagledavajući taj fenomen u kontekstu Zapatista iz Meksika, koji vode bitku protiv vlade, dolazimo do zaključka da je to još uvek veoma naivna ideja informacijskog rata. Etnička populacija koja negde pokušava da se suprotstavi, revolt protiv moći i mi koji doprinosimo njihovoj borbi koristeći tzv. haktivističke strategije. To je još uvek romantičarska ideja iz polovine devedesetih, jer ako sada odemo na Internet možemo videti informacijski rat koji se danonoćno odvija. Ali ne radi se samo o Zapatistima, već o ogromnoj količini spama koji primamo (spam – neželjene informacije kojima smo izloženi, bilo putem imejla ili na neki drugi način), i gde smo svi potpuno pretrpani količinom informacija. Ako nečim doprinosite mejling listi ili nekoj diskusiji, morate se dobro pripremiti da ne biste bili iskasapljeni. Ako to ne razumete, bićete uhvaćeni i preplavljeni jednom vrstom on-line neprijateljstva koja trenutno vlada Internetom. Mislim da to ima veze sa sazrevanjem medija. Više nismo maleni geto, mesto na kom se možemo pretvarati da živimo u boljem svetu. Internet je refleksija društva u celini. Svi su uključeni. Mislim da ovoga moramo biti svesni. Internet više nije alternativni prostor. Sve što se može sresti u društvu, naći ćete i na Internetu.

Razgovor vođen u kuda.org, 21. 09. 2002.

Izveštaj iz Indije

Intervju sa Raks medijskim kolektivom (Monika Narula, Jibeš Bagči, Sudabrata Sengupta) kao koinicijatorima Saraija, zajedno sa Ravi Vasudevan i Ravi Sundaram iz Centra za izučavanje društava u razvoju, Delhi

Pitanje: Možete li nam reći nešto više o medijskom kolektivu Raks (Raqs Media Collective/SARAI) kao kombinaciji umetničkog rada i društvenog aktivizma?

Odgovor: Mi ne bismo hteli da opisujemo Sarai samo kao prostor za umetničku produkciju ili društveni aktivizam. Možda bi se mogao bolje shvatiti, prvenstveno i jednostavno, kao prostor za promišljanje i praktičan rad na temu gradova, različitih oblika medijske prakse, prirode, istorije komunikacije, politike znanja i informacija. Ovaj misleći prostor se susreće, kritički učestvuje i uzima u obzir i produkciju znanja, značenja i uticaja kao i kritičku reakciju društva. To znači da ljudi, koji se u nekim drugim kontekstima nazivaju 'umetnicima' ili 'teoretičarima' ili 'tehničarima' ili 'kreativnim praktičarima' ili 'društvenim aktivistima', mogu pronaći načine razmišljanja, delovanja i stvaranja unutar Saraija, koji nisu neophodno vezani ili predeterminisani tim etiketama.

P: Da li je to 'etiketiranje' više deo globalnih procesa koji se dešavaju stapanjem novih komunikacionih tehnologija i kulturne produkcije? Da li je rezultat koji se dobije važniji od samog procesa?

O: Ne, etiketiranje se dešava zbog toga što (širom sveta) živimo u društvenom poretku koji teži da klasifikuje ljude i smesti ih u kutije, gde će se onda njima lakše upravljati.

Mi smo skloni da mislimo da su procesi podjednako važni kao i rezultati, ali ponekad je i proces sam po sebi važan, čak i ako 'rezultat' i nije najjasniji.

P: Kada i zašto je nastala ideja za pravljenje „Leksikona digitalnih dobara'' (Lexicon of Digital Commons)?

O: Ideja za pravljenje „Leksikona digitalnih dobara'' je nastala kada smo 2001. godine u medijskom kolektivu Raks radili na instalaciji/projektu koji se bavio zakonom, staništem i urbanim prostorom. Ovaj projekat je nazvan „28°28" N/77°15" E : Koordinate svakodnevnog života (The Coordinates of Everyday Life)''. Istovremeno smo se interesovali i za rad na stvaranju platforme za razmenu kulturnog materijala, koja bi omogućila pristup, preuzimanje (download) i transformaciju svačije produkcije, bez predrasuda u traženju vlasništva, čak i u pogledu autorskog potpisa. Ovaj projekat se razvio u Opuscommons.net vebsajt, a mi još uvek radimo na ovim idejama, iako u kontekstu koji probija prvobitan okvir. Pokušavamo da mislimo o mogućnosti offline/online stvaranja sadržaja u službi digitalne kreativnosti na sličan način na koji je to pokušano

u projektu Opus, sa projektom Sajbermahala (Cybermohalla) u Saraiju. Ovo će javnosti postati poznato kao projekat „Apna Opus" ili „Naš opus (Our Own Opus)".

Ovo je bilo malo dodatnih informacija. „Leksikon" smo napisali mi kao vežbu u pokušaju razjašnjavanja konceptualnih polja kojima se bavimo u ovim projektima, za nas same. Hteli smo da vidimo da li je moguće koristiti metafore iz oblasti digitalne tehnologije i na duhovit način ih primeniti probajući, na taj način, da dosegnemo tangencijalno razumevanja urbanih realnosti, zajednice, kreativnosti. Ispalo je da je „Leksikon" korisna mapa naših ideja ili za naše ideje, a termini koji su se pojavili u njemu i dalje podupiru većinu onoga čime se bavimo i predstavljaju neku vrstu konceptualnih temelja.

P: Čini se da se „Leksikon" odnosi na isticanje sve jače veze između tehnologije i društva? Zašto je društveni aspekt novih tehnologija toliko važan?

O: Važno je razumeti društveni aspekt svih vrsta tehnologija, novih ili starih. Tehnologija koja je omogućila ručno kopiranje prepisivanjem je u srednjem veku dovela do posebne vrste odnosa između moći, vlasništva, kontrole reprodukcije i cirkulacije manuskripta i znanja, koje je, kako je pisar postajao manje više 'rob teksta', bilo istovremeno i intimnije i više hijerarhijsko. To se promenilo kada je na scenu stupila štamparska presa. Knjige su postale objekat masovne proizvodnje, koji nije bilo potrebno nagomilavati ili vezivati samo za police. Prevodi i višestruka izdanja su učinili znanje i kulturu pristupačnijim.

Slično tome, fotokopir ili faks su omogućili novu vrstu politike u osamdesetim, u istočnoj Evropi i Kini. Personalni računar i Internet i jednostavnost digitalne reprodukcije uvode nove faktore koji utiču na odnos moći i znanja. Oni stvaraju novu solidarnost i nov disparitet jer ljudi komuniciraju na nov način. Svi ovi socijalni aspekti novih tehnologija podležu razmatranju.

Konačno, odnos između mašina i ljudi je u stvari indirektan odnos između ljudi. Ljudi su ti koji dizajniraju, prave i rade sa mašinama. Tehnologija otelotvoruje ljudsku kreativnost, rad, izrabljivanje, nemir, zadovoljstvo i bol. U najdubljem smislu, sve mašine su protetičke naprave; ponašaju se kao produžetak ili intervencija u ili na telu ljudskog bića.

Komunikacione tehnologije i svi novi mediji su po definiciji društveni. One se bave društvenošću, onim što se dešava kada ljudi žele da pričaju i slušaju jedni druge. Pričanje i slušanje su politički činovi. Ako neki ljudi sve vreme pričaju, a drugi sve vreme slušaju, to je onda jedna vrsta političke postavke; ako niko ne priča, onda je to druga vrsta političkog aranžmana; ako neki ljudi 'prisluškuju' druge, ako odgovaraju, ako osećaju da su isključeni iz konverzacije, ako su sprečeni u pokušaju da govore, ako osoba ima slobodu da kaže drugom ono što je upravo čula - sve ovo ukazuje na razne vrste političkog i društvenog aranžmana i zaista duboko skrivenu politiku informacija i komunikacije.

Sve što je navedeno se može uočiti i kada je reč o novim medijima: širina propusnog opsega (bandwidth), prisustvo ili odustvo nadgledanja, institucije za zaštitu intelektualne svojine, prisustvo ili odsustvo cenzora. To su pitanja tehnologije, pitanja dizajna hardvera ili softvera, kao što su pitanja i ko sluša, ko govori, koliko, kome itd.

Zbog toga bi svaki oblik komunikacije i svaki komad hardvera i softvera koji omogućava komunikaciju, trebalo istražiti u političkom i društvenom smislu. To nije zbog toga da bi se zahtevao primat društvenog i političkog, već da bi se prihvatilo i razumelo da se ne može pobeći od društvene dimenzije tehnologije.

P: Danas je kritički diskurs ustanovljen kao mejnstrim oblik dijaloga, od najviših struktura društva do potpuno marginalizovanih pojedinaca. Koji aspekt kritike zastupa SARAI?

O: Postoji velik broj vrsta kritičkog diskursa. Neki zauzimaju centralnu poziciju unutar mejnstrim diskursa. Mi, međutim, smatramo da postoji i da mora biti mesta za kritički stav prema otvaranju novih prostora misli, potrebno je dati podstreka radoznalosti i osigurati da provlađujuću kulturnu i društvenu realnost na shvatamo kao večitu i nepromenljivu.

Mi u Saraiju smo posvećeni modelima kritike koji ne narušavaju otvorenost u razmišljanju i delanju. Ponekad se dešava da je neko 'kritičan' više po navici nego na smislen način. Kada kažemo 'po navici', mislimo na automatsko postavljanje u protivničku poziciju, izvesnu sklonost ka negativitetu, želju za konfliktom radi samog konflikta. Ovakva 'kritika radi kritike' nas može dovesti do gubitka intelektualne i kreativne nepopustljivosti.

Želimo da istaknemo i ukažemo na produktivnu kritičnost koja ostaje živa kada se radi o postavljanju pitanja, koja traži rešenje izvan granica trivijalnog i lakog odgovora. Želimo da postavimo i pokrenemo sponu koja bi povezivala različite vrste pitanja.

Naravno radeći ovo, isto tako želimo da u svakom momentu ostanemo živi pitajući se šta je to što intelektualnom ili kreativnom metodu, bilo kojem obliku ili praksi izražavanja ili konfiguraciji prostora, omogućava i dopušta slobodan i hrabar govor; o samoorganizaciji; o načinima na koje je moguće raditi a koji nisu pod prisilom; o protokolima ponašanja i komuniciranja koji su uključujući. Praksu i naviku 'produktivne kritičnosti' vidimo kao veoma korisnu u svemu ovome.

Produktivna kritičnost je pozitivan senzibilitet; više je zainteresovana za stvaranje i podršku načinima slobodnog delovanja u svetu nego za sam gest konfrontacije. Bazira se na shvatanju da ljudi koji kreiraju i prave stvari, pitaju i pažljivo slušaju, stvaraju uslove za kontinuiranu transformaciju sveta.

P: Pitanje tržišta i odnosi unutar nove ekonomije menjaju društvo, što ima svoje pozitivne i negativne posledice. Može li se uticati na tok/pravac transformacije?

O: Ako, na opštem nivou, pomislimo da se na pravac transformacije u društvu ne može uticati, tada bismo mi ili bilo ko drugi kada je o tome reč, jednostavno mogli prestati sa razmišljanjem, čitanjem, pisanjem, stvaranjem ili činjenjem bilo čega sa našim umom, očima, rukama i svešću. Izjava „Umetnost (ili kulturna/intelektualna aktivnost) ne menja svet" je kliše, govori isto koliko i potpuno suprotna izjava - „Umetnost menja svet". Umetnička i intelektualna aktivnost je deo elemenata koji čine svet onakvim kakav jeste. Kada se umetnička praksa, ili principi istraživanja i razmišljanja promene, menja se i svet; kada se menja svet, umetnost i intelektualna aktivnost se takođe menjaju kao odgovor svetu koji se menja.

Tržište i društveni odnosi koji kontrolišu produkciju i razmenu robe bazirani na principu najamnog rada nisu izumi onoga što se naziva 'nova ekonomija'. Najdublji slojevi 'nove ekonomije' sežu unazad do sedamnaestog veka, ako ne i ranije.

Za nas važno i kritičko pitanje ostaje ono o razumevanju dinamike moći i kontrole. Šta je to što doprinosi nedostatku slobode i jednakosti? Zašto bogati intelektualni i kreativni resursi moraju biti veštački podstaknuti da obuku ludačku košulju oskudice, ako ne da bi osigurali to da oni sami ostanu 'vredni'? Ovo su pitanja na koja se može naići umetničkom i intelektualnom istragom, a čineći to dovodi se u pitanje monopol izvesnih priča ili objašnjenja. Bilo bi možda prerano stići do konačnog zaključka o tome da li ili ne ovaj skepticizam, prema objašnjenjima koja osiguravaju kontrolu tržišnih sila ili države nad našom imaginacijom, menja ili je već promenio svet. Jedno je sigurno, mi svet posmatramo na drugi način zbog svih stvari koje pročitamo, čujemo ili vidimo. Gledajući na svet drugačije ponekada počinjemo da preuzimamo korake na koje se ranije ne bismo odlučili. Svet se menja podjednako tiho, korak po korak, kontinuirano, kao što se menja iznenada i radikalno.

P: Da li detektovanje društva i novih društvenih odnosa proizilazi iz društvenih okolnosti ili je konfrontacija sa tim svesna odluka? Kakvo je vaše iskustvo u pogledu Indijskog društva?

O: Konfrontacija je povremeno potrebna. Postoji vreme kada je situaciju nemoguće tolerisati i kada je neophodno odbiti i odbaciti je, kategorično i izričito. U velikom broju slučajeva konfrontacija može biti kontraproduktivna. Kada ste previše eksplicitni, možete upozoriti snage koje pokušavate da prevladate ili podredite vašem postojanju, i one vam mogu snažno uzvratiti, posebno ako pokušavate da uradite nešto drugačije i odnoseći se kritički prema tome. Ovo iskustvo smo stekli živeći i radeći u društvu kao što je Indija danas.

U Indiji, danas, postoji velik broj mogućnosti spremnih za nove i inovativne oblike kreativnih aktivnosti. To je uglavnom zbog toga što su institucije kulture (izuzimajući komercijalnu filmsku idustriju i donekle izdavaštvo) slabe i velik deo kulturnog prostora je prazan, čekajući, na neki način, da bude ispunjen novim idejama i aktivnostima. U isto vreme postoji snažno prisustvo mehanizama cenzure i samo-cenzure. Ovi meh-

anizmi su i zvanični i nezvanični, vođeni od strane države kao i od strane ne-državnih aktera.

Zadatak kulturnog radnika i intelektualca u ovim okolnostima je da izbori prostor za uvećanje slobode, za razmenu i uvećanje znanja i kreativnosti, tako što će obezbediti da budno 'oko cenzora' bude, u nedostatku bolje reči, 'ometeno'.

Ovo može podrazumevati i stvaranje radije velikog broja malih, agilnih, ponekad efemernih inicijativa, nego koncentrisati se na velike i vidljive događaje i strategije koje su u stvari mnogo ranjivije u smislu kontrole.

P: Opšta mesta – polna ravnopravnost, ekologija, ljudska prava. Koliko zapadni modeli utiču na transformaciju tradicionalne Indije?

O: Vreme je da prestanemo razmišljati o razlikama između modela koji su 'zapadni' i 'tradicionalno Indijski'. Možda je vreme da se zapitamo o ispravnosti samog termina 'model'. Moramo se, u svakom slučaju, pitati koji metod, oblik ili obrazac uvećava slobodu, doprinosi ljudskoj sreći i kreativnosti, a istovremeno čini najmanje štete po ljudsku okolinu – koji je metod najpravičniji. Postoje izvesni aspekti i elementi svih tradicija, istorija i kultura (istočne, zapadne, moderne, tradicionalne) koji čine uspostavljanje individualnih prava i prava zajednica, ravnopravnijih odnosa među polovima, pitanja ekologije, lakšim. Potpuno suprotna izjava je takođe istinita. Mudar stručnjak iz oblasti kulturne politike bi trebalo da bude sposoban da rukovodi različitim elementima, na bazi onoga što je relevantno za specifičnost nekog vremena i prostora, inkorporirajući i poznate i strane elemente kako bi obezbedio da se sve što nas okružuje i sve o čemu se misli iznova preispituje.

P: Možete li nam reći o povezivanju i umrežavanju na lokalnom i globalnom nivou: alati, potencijal, mogućnosti, korist jugoistočne Azije?

O: Mi se nalazimo u Delhiju, koji je lociran u severnoj Indiji i koji okupira značajnu poziciju unutar južnoazijskog podkontinenta. Ljudi iz cele republike žive u Delhiju, govore velik broj raznovrsnih jezika i upražnjavaju sve svetske najveće religije i stvaraju mnoge kulture. Živimo u gradu migranata. Migranti shvate značaj umrežavanja pre nego što nauče bilo šta drugo.

Nismo mnogo udaljeni od zapadne Indije, jugozapadne Kine, Pakistana i Avganistana. Centralna Azija, jugoistočna Evropa, jugoistočna Azija i daleki jug i severoistok Indije u nekom smislu su na jednakom rastojanju od mesta na kom se mi nalazimo. Pored toga, postoje i bliske veze kroz imigracione i ekonomske kanale sa britanskim ostrvima, zapadnom Evropom, istočnom Afrikom, Tibetom, Nepalom, Bangladešom, Australijom i Severnom Amerikom, a zbog skorašnjih istorijsko-političkih razloga i sa Rusijom, bivšom Jugoslavijom i istočnom Evropom. Ovakav osećaj geografskog prostora vas upućuje na razmišljanje o tome da se nalazite na nekoliko preklapajućih raskršća izgrađenih kroz istoriju, a oblikovanih savremenom realnošću. Ovo čini iskust-

vo življenja u Delhiju srodnim onom životu koji je pod uticajem velikog broja konverzacija koje se preklapaju, čitanja mnogih jezika, radoznalosti o postojanju mnoštva različitih realnosti. Mnogima od nas je engleski jezik zajednički sa ostalima koji ga govore širom sveta.

Delhi je takođe i zgusnut tehnološki prostor. Označen je gustom intersekcijom kako formalnih tako i neformalnih informacionih industrija različite veličine. Postoje ogromni centri za pružanje informacija putem telefona, fabrike softvera kao i mali izdavači, legalni i nelegalni prodavci softvera i velik broj različitih praktičara medija. Svuda, u svakom kvartu, postoje sajberkafei sa jeftinom Internet vezom i prodavnice telefona iz kojih možete obavljati međunarodne razgovore.

Sve ovo ukazuje na mogućnost mnogostrukog povezivanja: povezivanje različitih kultura i kulturnih praksi, različitih jezika i načina obavljanja stvari; povezivanje intelektualnih, umetničkih, društvenih i tehničkih aktivnosti. Šta možemo nazvati etikom i praksom 'zgusnute povezanosti'? Šta bi mogla biti ključna karakteristika 'zgusnute povezanosti'?

> To što omogućuje komunikaciju svih činilaca i što je sposobna da poveća komunikacione kapacitete onih koji su 'slabi komunikatori' zbog strukturalnih, logističkih, društvenih i političkih razloga. To znači da gusta komunikaciona mreža, kao i tropska šuma, ima veoma raznovrstan i bogat ekosistem.
> To da prostor 'zgusnute povezanosti' pravi mesta za različite ritmove, intenzitete i frekvencije komunikacione aktivnosti i ima prostora za staro isto kao i za novo, za brze kao i za spore medije.
> Da ima dovoljno habova, konektora i naprava za preusmeravanje koji omogućavaju komunikaciju kroz svu tu raznolikost. Ovo podrazumeva mehanizme koji prevode, naprave koje omogućavaju saradnju, peer-to-peer mreže koje omogućavaju razmenu i deljenje i dobara kojima razni akteri mogu doprineti i služiti se njima.

Ovo shvatanje je proizašlo iz načina na koji stvari rade i ne rade u fizičkom i kulturnom prostoru u kojem se nalazimo i možemo ga primeniti na bilo koju ideju o tome kako mreža medijskih inicijativa i organizacija može nastati ili se ponašati posebno u prostorima van tradicionalnih 'baza' kulture novih medija u zapadnoj Evropi, Severnoj Americi, Australiji i obodu Pacifika.

P: Indija je dobro poznata po 'izvozu' stručnjaka za softver. Odliv mozgova? Kakvo je vaše mišljenje, kao nekog ko živi u Indiji i uporedite ga sa najčešćim viđenjem Indije sa zapadnjačke tačke gledišta?

O: Izvoz softvera ni u kom slučaju ne predstavlja 'odliv mozgova'. Viđenje Indije kao izvoznika softvera je umnogome uveličano. Postoji velik broj operacija zasnovanih na angažovanju spoljne pomoći (outsourcing), posebno u Severnoj Americi, koje koriste indijske pogone za nešto što se zove 'Bug Fixing' odnosno ispravljanje grešaka i niz drugih procesa na montažnoj traci pravljenja softvera. To nije velik fenomen, iako je u

porastu, i privlači značajnu pažnju zajedno sa ostalim granama industrije koja se bavi izmeštanjem poslovnih procesa (Business Process Outsourcing - BPO), koja uključuje transkripciju, sekretarske usluge, izdavanje karata, rad telefonskih informativnih centara i druge operacije.

'Kupci tela' koji rade za multinacionalne softverske korporacije kratkoročno unajmljuju indijske programere koji rade pod ugovorom i nekada bivaju premešteni u SAD, posebno u Kaliforniju, i to u periodima kada postoji velika potražnja za visoko stručnim kadrom u industriji softvera.

Takozvani 'odliv mozgova' se u stvari odnosi na emigraciju obučenih tehničara, naučnika i intelektualaca iz Indije u druge zemlje, uglavnom u SAD i Veliku Britaniju, a u manjem broju u Australiju. 'Odliv mozgova' nikada nije bio fenomen koji je u bilo kom smislu bio štetan po interese kapitala i industrije u Indiji, ili rad institucija obrazovanja i istraživanja. Tehničari i intelektualci koji su studirali u Indiji i koji odlaze na prekookeansko 'usavršavanje' i rade u međunarodnim institucijama i organizacijama i ostaju u kontaktu sa svojim kolegama i institucijama u Indiji. Ako ništa drugo, te institucije i preduzeća imaju koristi od tih veza. Razmišljati u pravcu 'odliva mozgova' u Indiji, u stvari je veoma čudan način reflektovanja brige zbog rasizma i ksenofobije na Zapadu zbog Indijaca i Kineza koji preuzimaju svet sa svojim neiskrenim i lukavim mozgovima.

Uzgred, najveći broj ljudi koji emigriraju iz Indije u zemlje zaliva, zapadnu Evropu i Severnu Ameriku, su ljudi koji rade u fabrikama, radionicama, bolnicama (kao sestre), malim prodavnicama, restoranima i kao poljoprivredna radna snaga – kako bi se ovo trebalo zvati, možda - 'odliv mišića'? Niko se i ne brine zbog 'odliva mišića'. U stvari, baš nasuprot.

P: Kakav je status Pokreta za slobodan softver u Indiji, u kreativnom i društvenom smislu?

O: U Indiji trenutno postoji prilično jak Pokret za slobodan softver. Najveći deo je baziran među studentima informatike i programerima, ali postoje i naznake 'laičkog' razumevanja i prihvatanja kulture slobodnog softvera. Frederik Noronha, aktivista Pokreta za slobodan softver, baziran u Goi, već piše 'istoriju' pokreta za slobodan, *libre* i softver otvorenog koda (FLOSS) u Indiji (tako da verovatno postoji nešto o čemu će se pisati 'istorija'!).

Postoje grupe korisnika GNU/Linuxa u svim većim i mnogim manjim gradovima, i aktivan pokret za 'lokalizaciju' GNU/Linuxa tj. njegovo adaptiranje mnogim indijskim jezicima, a posebno bengalskom, tamilskom, kanadaskom i hindiju.

Počinje da se javlja i razumevanje društvenog i značaja FLOSS-a za zajednicu. Ljudi koji rade u NVO-u, društvenim pokretima i drugi koji sebe smatraju delom 'demokratske' levice počinju da izražavaju interesovanje za 'političku ekonomiju'

FLOSS-a, iako ovaj interes nije po svaku cenu uniformnog karaktera. Razne državne vlade i vladina ministarstva u Indiji su, takođe zainteresovani za FLOSS. S vremena na vreme, dolazi do žive debate u štampi oko toga da li postoje ili ne postoje zasluge slobodnog softvera. Ništa od ovoga nije bilo značajno prisutno pre samo pet godina, i ovo je nešto što je počelo tek nedavno da se dešava.

Međutim, zanimanje za slobodan softver sve više ima korisnički, funkcionalan karakter - često ga ljudi koriste jer je jeftin, dopušta adaptaciju prema sopstvenim potrebama i stabilan je. Još uvek nije privukao svu kreativnu energiju koju mogao imati, ali mi mislimo da će se to promeniti, a jednom kada se napori za lokalizaciju konačno prevedu u lako i jednostavno nabavan softverski resurs sa dovoljnom podrškom na indijskim jezicima, ceo scenario korišćenja slobodnog softvera će podleći brzoj i radikalnoj ekspanziji. Mislimo da to nije tako daleko, i da bi tada moglo doći do prave eksplozije kreativnih načina rada sa slobodnim softverom u Indiji.

Ekonomija, politika i kulturna produkcija u globalnom digitalnom dobu

Intervju sa Saskiom Sasen, Čikago

Pitanje: Da li nam možeš reći nešto više u vezi sa globalizacijom i različitim aspektima kulturne produkcije? Jedna od tema za koju smo zainteresovani je razvoj zakona o zaštiti autorskih prava i različitih oblika kršenja intelektualne svojine po celom svetu. Možeš li nam bliže dočarati šta se dešava u toj oblasti kad je u pitanju globalizacija?

Odgovor: To je dovedeno do krajnosti, a postoji u sistemu već jako dugo. To prelazi prag na taj način što je sada sve postalo vlasništvo, pa je tako, na primer, čuveni slučaj semena biljki koji u sebe uključuje informacije koje možda potiču od vašeg genetskog koda, a koje se isto tretiraju kao vlasništvo. To prevazilazi sve granice i tako nešto, istorijski posmatrano, do sada nismo imali. U tom smislu to je drugačiji pokret u odnosu na prošlost, gde smo imali zaštitu privatne svojine i privatizaciju mnogih elemenata. Iskreno govoreći, ne verujem da je to održivo. Međutim, postoje mnogi delovi koji su već primenjeni, koji će biti, na neki način, održivi. Postoji jedan drugi elemenat, koji poteže pitanje ove ogromne nejednakosti, koje smo svedoci, ovo totalno oduzimanje prava glasa. A dugoročno gledano, mislim da će to uzvratiti udarac – stvaranjem bumerang efekta. A onda, tu je i Francuska revolucija. Marija Antoaneta rekla je: „Dajte im kolač“, ali je ona izgubila glavu. Ne verujem da istorija može prihvatiti ove krajnosti našeg prisvajanja i uzimanja. U međuvremenu, oni će se sjajno provoditi, biće mnogo patnje, mnogi poljoprivrednici osiromašiće kao nikada do sada. Dakle, to je destruktivno. To je flagrantna zloupotreba koncepta privatne svojine, ali smatram da je toliko ekstremna da je neodrživa. Pogledajte samo šta se dešava sa CD-ima i daunlodovanjem muzike sa Interneta. Mehanizmi kontrole ne funkcionišu, jer u ovom slučaju postoje mogućnosti ugrađene u tehnologije koje podrivaju taj model vlasništva znanja, proizvoda itd. Imam osećaj da će to napraviti mnogo štete, ali da je neodrživo. To ne znači da će posle toga sve biti lepo, ali ono što nam se danas dešava, način na koji se želi sprovesti projekat privatne svojine, malo je preteran. Pređena je i granica, i u tom smislu, to je nešto novo.

P: Interesuje me pitanje Evropske unije kao nove blage imperije – imperije budućnosti koja se razvija. U maju ove godine deset centralnoevropskih zemalja ušlo je u EU i ovaj niz zakona o zaštiti autorskih prava i intelektualne svojine će verovatno doći kao deo procesa standardizacije. Tokom predavanja spomenula si ideju da će nacionalno nestati. Kako će različiti standardi ove sve veće imperije uticati na kulturnu produkciju?

O: Postoji nekoliko stvari koje želim da istaknem. Jedna je ta da nacionalna država, koristeći nacionalne institucije, obavlja deo posla primenjivanja ovih novih međunarodnih standarda, pravila i normi. Nije da nacionalne države nemaju udela u stvaraju

globalne vladavine. Jedna od stvari vezanih za finansije, koju smo već videli kod većine centralnoevropskih zemalja, je da su nacionalne države poput Češke republike i Poljske, obavile posao kroz pravne, sudske i izvršne organe i na taj način primenile pravila. Činjenica da imate međunarodnu vladavinu ne znači da nacionalna država ne može da obavlja posao primenjivanja međunarodnog režima. Mislim da može. Još na dve stvari bih htela da ukažem u vezi sa ovim. Mislim da je proširenje interesantan predlog. Jedan od načina na koji ovo može da se posmatra je da će to biti pravi iza- zov za Evropsku uniju i ona će imati posla sa zemljama koje su prilično različite. One nemaju zajedničku istoriju koje imaju zapadnoevropske zemlje. Tako da će to povući za sobom i to pitanje. One će ili uspeti ili propasti. Ako uspeju, to će biti zato što su naučile, zato što su stekle sposobnost da se bave poslom koji čini mnogo elemenata, uključujući građansko društvo, kulturno delovanje itd. U radu koji će biti potreban da se uspešno sprovede proširenje, Evropska unija će naučiti kako da prebrodi ogromnu šarolikost posredstvom zakona, normi, dogovora i institucija, a ne bombi i oružja koje SAD voli da koristi kao način da razreši ovakve situacije. Drugim rečima, ulazak u posao kakav je proširenje, uspeće da ojača meku imperijalnu sposobnost. Meni taj fak- tor proširenja daje signal da se imperija razvija. Ovo je jedan oblik imperije, „blaga imperija", i ne bih se iznenadila ako uspe ova faza proširenja, i ako bude sledeće faze koja će biti veća nego što predviđamo. Ne znam da li će biti manje ili više uspešna, ali ideja koju pokušavam da istaknem je da sama težina ovog zadatka tera Evropsku uniju da nauči kako ovo da izvede, kako ovo da izvedu sa sve većom raznovrsnošću, jer Centralna i Istočna Evropa su mnogo drugačije nego na primer Francuska i Nemačka, Nemačka i Holandija itd.

P: Da li moć uči iz svojih grešaka? Spomenula si 60-te i veliki broj liberalnih ideja (ne „neoliberalnih"), kao i kako su strukture moći otele ove ideje o individualnosti i fleksibilnosti da bi iskoristili san o ovoj „bejbi bum" generaciji? Oni žele individual- nost, ali žele da rade ono što hoće, dok njihovi roditelji žele da oni rade u fabrici od 9 do 17. Kako je ovo moguće?

O: Pa, nisam baš sigurna da moć uči iz svojih grešaka. Ali, moć uči iz teškoća koje se moraju rešiti ne bi li se sproveo projekat. U to sam ubeđena. Ali, pitanje je da li uči iz svojih grešaka? Teško mi je poverovati u to. Ne mislim da uči, jer u tom slučaju imperi- je bi trajale mnogo duže nego što traju. Ne, mislim da ne uči. Kada pogledate slučaj Avganistana, mislili su da su rešili dugu istoriju nemogućnosti spoljašnje kontrole Av- ganistana. Sada znaju da se, u stvari, Avganistan ne može kontrolisati. I ne mislim da moć uči iz svojih grešaka. Ali kada moć ima projekat, ona će učiti iz njegovih poteš- koća. Izobličavanje SAD je u tome da se ova zemlja pojavljuje sa svim tim ogromnim bombama, i tada neko vreme imate taj čitav vojno zabavni kompleks i rat kao simula- ciju. Da li SAD izvlači pouku iz tog haosa? Ne znam.

Pitali ste me za šezdesete i moram vam reći da sam što se toga tiče malo hendikepi- rana. Imam užasan problem da sagledam sliku kao pojedinac. Uopšte nisam tip psi- hologa i teško mi je to da shvatim. Vidim stvari vezane za strukturu i ono što smo ura- dili – dinamiku, svađu i način kako se suočiti sa svađom. Vidim politiku i nemoćnost.

Individualci i ovi ludi oblici individualnosti koji se mogu videti u Americi, oni su skoro hermetički zatvoreni. Moj suprug uvek kaže: „Možda imam spiritualan život, ali nemam psihološki život!" Primetila sam nešto u vašem pitanju što je više sistemsko, u smislu postojanje ironične izobličenosti nečega što je šezdesetih bilo ugrađeno u normama koje su omogućavale one isključene i osiromašene. To je projekat stvaranja više jednakosti. To možete videti u velikom broju donetih zakona, siromaštvu, Zakonu o imigraciji iz 1964. koji ukida rasne kvote itd. A onde se ovo prenelo do drugog praga. Kao i kod privatne svojine. To postoji već dugo, ali ono što mi danas radimo sa intelektualnom svojinom, je to da zapravo pomeramo do drugog praga, gde ona tada postaje promenjeno stanje.

P: Da li ćeš zvanično učestvovati na Svetskom samitu o informacijskom društvu koji se održava u Ženevi? Da li ćeš prisustvovati?

O: Zapravo i jedno i drugo. Akreditovana sam, a imamo i konferenciju na kojoj predsedavam odborom. Konferencija je deo foruma o akterima i aktivistima građanskog društva. Učestvovaće mnogi ljudi koje poznajete. Na konferenciji koju smo organizovali učestvovaće oko šezdeset ljudi i mnogi aktivisti iz celog sveta: iz Južne Amerike, Azije i Južne Afrike. Dakle, to će biti u okviru formalne konferencije. Ali devetog uveče radićemo nešto napolju, Florijan Šnajder to organizuje. Ne znam koliko će snažan biti protesni skup, imam osećaj da je malo oslabljen. Da li vi imate osećaj da je snažan?

P: Nisam baš sigurna. Ja sam na pripremnoj mejling listi; ljudi pokušavaju da organizuju događaj, ali bez pravog cilja. To je moje mišljenje. Tako da je velika prednost zvaničnog samita to što je tako organizovan i tako čvrste strukture.

O: Ali ponekad oni budu vrlo uspešni. Na primer, protesni mitinzi žena u Najrobiju i Pekingu su bili neverovatni. Ali sada imam osećaj da ovaj protesni događaj neće biti baš uspešan.

P: Stavovi protesnog skupa su vrlo jasni, barem na papiru. Mnogo su kritičniji prema nekim od plemenitih ideja zvaničnog samita, poput ideje o prevazilaženju digitalne podele.

O: U potpunosti se slažem, ali to neće biti masovan događaj. Ono što je potrebno su ljudi koji nisu razmišljali o ovim pitanjima, ljudi koji, iako su levičarski orjentisani, smatraju da je digitalna podela problem. To bi trebalo biti više neko predavanje koje će oni usvojiti. Trebalo bi se koristiti za to, a to je ono što se, po meni, neće desiti na protesnom skupu.

P: Šta će po tebi biti vidljivi rezultati zvaničnog samita? To je dugoročan projekat, sledeći će se desiti 2005. u Tunisu. Interesuje me ovaj megalomanski plan za izgradnju informacijskog društva. Šta će se dogoditi sa tom idejom?

O: Ovi skupovi su epifenomenalne intervencije. Izgradnja informacijske ekonomije sa svim relevantnim elementima se ne dešava na ovim skupovima. Ovo je jedan način da

se stvori tekst za javnu potrošnju, a onda izgleda kao da su tu umešani i neki dobri ljudi sa dobrim namerama i onda to cirkuliše kao lepa priča o toj stvari. I zato su protestne aktivnosti toliko bitne. Mnogi aktivisti koji koriste Internet nemaju sredstva da razviju kritičku analizu onoga što se dešava. Tako da bi protesni skup trebao predstavljati predavanje koje pokazuje ljudima otprilike ovo: „Mi ćemo vam objasniti kako izgleda naša kritička analiza koja ide dalje od digitalne podele". Ne mislim da se to dogodilo, mislim da su skupovi epifenomenalni tj. razotkriveni. Takođe, program zvaničnog samita okuplja mnoge dobre ljude. Oni su ga otvorili za mnoge interesantne i čak kritičke levičarske grupe. Ali, struktura čitavog događaja je zasnovana na odloženom efektu, jer je poredak, u suštini, izgrađen. Tako da izgleda kao da samit u Ženevi i razni događaji Ujedinjenih nacija neće promeniti svetski informacijski poredak. Da li se slažete sa tim?

P: Definitivno. Sa zvaničnim samitom oni su samo šire tržište. Naterali su nerazvijene zemlje da kupe tehnologije i infrastrukturu.

O: To je užasno. Upravo sam napisala rad o tome kako su elektronski aktivisti iz globalnog juga bili inovativni sa tehnologijom. Ne radi se samo o nabavljanju najnovijih softvera i kompjutera koji šalje Majkrosoft.

P: U jednom od svojih eseja pričala si o ideji mobilnosti i hipermobilnosti. Da li se ovo odnosi na informacijsku industriju, infrastrukturu informacionih i komunikacionih tehnologija (ICT, Information and Communication Technologies) ili na nešto drugo?

O: Mislim da sam pričala o mobilnosti i stabilnosti i o ideji da na neki način imamo rafiniranu mobilnost iz koje onda prelazimo u hipermobilnost sa novom tehnologijom i digitalizacijom različitih sektora društva. To stvara ogromno izobličavanje i onemogućavanje. Mi smo se usredredili samo na taj ishod, a ne na hipermobilnost, finansijske instrumente koje mogu da cirkulišu po svetu u sekundi. To zadivljuje. Ali onda zanemarujemo stvari tako što samo posmatramo mobilnost, hipermobilnost, tehnologije i ono što one mogu, a potreban je svet materijalnosti da bi se dobio takav ishod. Želim da pronađem onaj drugi deo petlje, onaj za koji se ispostavilo da je duži deo, a koji zovemo hipermobilnost. To je samo jedan elemenat. Ukoliko se izostavi drugi deo petlje slede posledice, a to bi značilo da ukoliko želite da imate ovaj trenutak složenog procesa koji nazivamo hipermobilnost, potreban je osećaj mesta, potrebno je okruženje građenja, potrebni su ne samo profesionalni radnici već i jeftini nadničari. Želim da povratim ove stvari i, na taj način, učinim mogućim aktere i ideju mesta koji su učinjeni nevidljivim ili su nekako proterani iz priče ako samo posmatrate hipermobilnost. Dakle, za mene je to način da se kaže da su jeftini nadničari imigranti koji možda nikada nisu koristili kompjuter, još uvek deo infrastrukture, i da je to potrebno da bi se imala hipermobilnost, i ja želim da i ti radnici imigranti to znaju. Uvek to radim kad su u pitanju finansije. Finansije Menhetna sam razjasnila, one su uglavnom globalne finansije, u smislu svih tih radnika koje zahtevaju, uključujući i kamiondžije koji donose softver, toalet papir, sijalice i gde oni žive. I onda sam rekla: „U redu, ovo je

globalni finansijski sektor Njujorka. Da, postoji Vol Strit (Wall Street), postoje globalni tokovi, ali znate šta? Takođe postoje i imigrantske četvrti one u kojima živi bela radnička klasa, žene koje su službenice u bankama, kamiondžije. Potrebna im je industrijska zona za obavljanje mnogih usluga – industrijskih usluga." Ja to isto radim i kad je u pitanju hipermobilnost. A onda pričam o ovim preklapanjima. Šta je mobilno, a šta je nepokretno? Ne radi se samo o tome da su to hibridi, to su veoma jasni momenti. Koristim termin preklapanja da bih bila sugestivna, da su potrebni jedno drugom da bi se nadogradili jedno na drugo. A kad se doda stabilnost, kapitalna stabilnost će dodati hipermobilnost, tako da postoji dinamizam. Nije binarno.

P: Nije suprotno, već poput različitih aspekata.

O: Upravo tako. Niti je ovo hibridizam, a ni nema nejasnoću. Digitalno se definitivno razlikuje od zidova zgrade i ne bih želela da unesem hibridizam u tu sliku. Dakle, to je više ideja za mene. To je i realnost izobličena tako što je očarana hipermobilnošću i reprezentacija iz koje su proterani svi ti učesnici. Tako da imate, informacijski bogate i informacijski siromašne, što je takođe izobličavanje. Iskreno rečeno, veći deo nevladinih organizacija sa globalnog juga je u smislu korišćenja novih tehnologija mnogo napredniji nego globalni sever. One su im bile potrebne, jer telefon nije radio i faks je bio preskup. I čini mi se da je globalnom severu veoma teško to da shvati. Iz ograničenih sredstava globalnog juga ove nevladine organizacije su uspele da razviju mogućnosti, tako da oni nisu samo potrošači. Oni su izmislili nove načine uplitanja u nove tehnologije, što im uspeva jer imaju nisku širinu raspona radio signala i sporu konekciju. I iz ove inferiornosti razvili su mogućnosti. Oni kreiraju tehnološke inovacije u softveru, dok je globalni sever uglavnom pasivni konzument. Dakle, ne radi se samo zaostajanju u informaciji, već čitava stvar mnogo kompleksnija.

P: Da li je Indija tipičan primer za to? Oni imaju mnogo ljudi koji razvijaju „Open Source" i „Free Software."

O: Oni imaju neverovatno interesatne aplikacije „Open Source"-a. Ima puno ljudi koji su zaista naučili, stekli sposobnosti da izaču na kraj sa teškim situacijama. Biti u nepovoljnom položaju nije nešto apsolutno i konačno.

<div align="right">Razgovor vođen u Beogradu, 07. 12. 2003.</div>

<div align="right">Transkripcija intervjua nije autorizovana.</div>

Izveštaj iz Afrike

Intervju sa Markusom Nojsteterom, Johanesburg

Pitanje: Koje organizacije i pojedinci se bave umetnošću u oblasti novih medija u Africi?

Odgovor: Kada se govori o temama kao što su novi mediji ili digitalna umetnost u Africi, ne može se zanemariti priroda konteksta i zajednice koje se u okviru njega razvijaju. Usredsređenost na opstanak i strategije opstanka su esencijalni faktori koji utiču na produkciju i razvoj neophodnih sposobnosti i veština za rad na polju novih medija. Ovi faktori često nadjačavaju potrebu za kreativnim eksperimentima koji započinju da istražuju mogućnosti koje pruža tehnologija kada je reč o kreativnom izražavanju. Ovo je usmerilo razvoj novih medija uglavnom na umetnike koji su zainteresovani za ispitivanje odnosa između njihovih ideja i novih tehnologija. Sa ograničenim razumevanjem i resursima, razvoj umetničke prakse se uglavnom najviše odvijao u oblasti video umetnosti. Međutim, postoje praktičari koji su inspirisani mogućnostima za eksperimentisanje sa drugim tehnologijama kao medijumom i oni su u potrazi za platformom i publikom putem Interneta. Novi mediji, ili tačnije rečeno, digitalna umetnost, u Africi se polagano razvijaju kroz tradicionalne umetnike koji eksperimentišu sa tehnologijama kao što su digitalne kamere i foto-aparati, računari i digitalan zvuk. Ovi praktičari su potekli iz oblasti dizajna i digitalnog/onlajn oglašavanja i marketinga, i koriste svoje sposobnosti u stvaranju kreativnih eksperimenata.

Kako novi trendovi nastaju, iako u ograničenom obimu i prilično disparatno, tako nastaju i platforme koje pružaju podršku ishodima ovih trendova. Iako nedovoljno podržane i nepriznate, u okviru jedne šire potrebe za razvojem, određene galerije, zbirke i konkursi se opremaju za prezentaciju radova uglavnom vezanih za ekran, kao što su video i zvuk, prvenstveno zbog toga što je to u tehničkom i finansijskom smislu relativno lako izvodljivo, i za organizatore i za publiku. Ovo se, međutim, može primetiti samo kod malog broja zemalja i njihovih institucija. U oblasti obrazovanja i razvoja, kada je reč o organizacijama i medijskim centrima, dolazi do mnogo ozbiljnijeg zahvata u cilju edukacije zajednica i umetnika u korišćenju tehnologije. To je obično usmereno na razvoj sposobnosti za korišćenje računara za istraživanje uz pomoć Interneta, pravljenje vebsajtova, manipulaciju slikom i komunikaciju putem elektronske pošte.

Kjučna briga u razvoju ovih pojedinačnih institucija i organizacija je nedostatak komunikacije i razmene međusobnih aktivnosti. Ako se, na primer, pogleda kontekst južne Afrike, koja je možda najrazvijenija u oblasti digitalne umetnosti tj. umetnosti novih medija, na delu kontinenta ispod Sahare, vidimo da tu postoje institucije koje stimulišu digitalnu aktivnost, na primer univerzitet Witwatersrand u Johanesburgu, na kojem, u okviru magistarskih studija, postoji kurs iz digitalnih medija. Zatim,

Univerzitet grada Johanesburga na kojemu postoji kurs iz oblasti multimedija, kao i Univerzitet Kejptaun sa studijama filma i multimedija. Ovde se resursi i znanje mogu deliti i razmenjivati mnogo efikasnije, pritom razvijajući istovremeno mrežu i bazu za razmenu podataka. Iako ove institutcije rade u oblasti digitalnih aktivnosti, instrumenti i strategije za digitalnu komunikaciju još uvek nisu efikasno primenjeni u stvaranju mreža i komunikacije.

Organizacija kao što je 'Afričke boje' (Africancolours.com) ima, međutim, drugačiji fokus. Bazirani u Zimbabveu, radeći onlajn, njihov glavni cilj je da uspostave komunikaciju i razmenu informacija, putem mreže, među umetnicima iz regiona. Iskorišćavajući internet kafee za obuku i saradnju sa drugim projektima, Africancolours.com je izgradio informacioni hab koji koristi medij da bi profilisao kreativne aktivnosti na kontinentu. Pošto profilacija nije isključivo ni digitalna ni iz oblasti umetnosti novih medija, ovo je efikasan metod za predstavljanje platforme, tehnologije i izazova umetničkoj zajednici.

Slično njima, Triangle Arts Network, koja u svetu ima izuzetno veliku mrežu u okviru koje se ostvaruju programi razmene i boravka umetnika, trenutno se bavi iznalaženjem efikasnijih načina korišćenja Interneta za međusobnu komunikacijsku razmenu. Unutar Afrike je postojala posebno opsežna obuka umetnika koji rade na razvoju mreže, što dopušta uvećavanje baze znanja i sposobnosti, ne doprinoseći na taj način samo svom onlajn prisustvu kao mreže, a nas informišući o umetnicima, radionicama, izložbama i rezultatima, već stvarajući zajednicu opismenjenu za komunikaciju putem elektronske pošte, koja shvata vrednost razmene informacija.

U pokušaju da se na kontinentu povežu organizacije ovog tipa, kako bi se stvorili čvršći temelji za razmenu i razvoj, neophodno je primeniti strategije koje su osetljive na kompleksnost političkog okruženja, probleme zdravstva i siromaštva, pismenosti i pristupa mreži i najbazičnijeg opstanka. Trenutno program UNESCO-a, Digi-Arts Afrika, pokušava da razvije strategije koje za cilj imaju izgradnju mreže čiji bi vlasnici u budućnosti bile lokalne zajednice. Istražujući kreativnu industriju postalo je jasno da postoji nedostatak komunikacije unutar regiona što bi mogao biti rezultat još uvek neefektivne komunikacije sa neformalnim mrežama. Nametnute vertikalne strukture za komunikaciju i razmenu ne stvaraju uslove za kupovinu udela, ne dopuštajući zajednicama preuzimanje vlasništva i iskorišćavanje resursa.

P: Kako se sam proces komunikacije sprovodi uz prisutnu jezičku barijeru, u vidu podele na anglofonu i frankofonu Afriku?

O: Komunikacija na kontinentu je otežana zbog podele na anglofonu i frankofonu populaciju. Komunikacioni i informacioni sistemi kao što su vebsajtovi su retko dvojezični i kreirani su tako da služe specifičnoj zajednici i regionu, što stvara barijeru i otežava zainteresovanim i aktivnim individuama i organizacijama da uče od svojih suseda, reaguju kroz teoriju ili primene strategije za stvaranje usaglašenije komunikacije, kao i zajedničku produkciju i teoretski pristup. Još jedan uticajan faktor je i velik broj

afričkih dijalekata koji često mapiraju različite mreže i interakcija sa osamostaljenim nacionalnim državama. Jezička barijera je takođe vidljiva u podeli na urbane i ruralne zajednice što se ogleda u savremenim i tradicionalnim pristupima. Jedan deo ove podele je, takođe zasnovan na promeni urbanog okruženja koje postaje više 'globalno' u samom svom razvoju, noseći sa sobom nove jezičke barijere, nove tehnologije sa novim sistemima znanja, i jezicima koje je potrebno naučiti da bi se moglo ići u korak sa savremenim svetom.

P: Na koji način se realizuje finansijska podrška nezavisnim inicijativama i da li ovakve organizacije imaju problema u dobijanju pouzdane pomoći?

O: Ne samo da su fondovi iz kojih se finansira kultura ograničeni, već retko postoje kategorije i sistemi u okviru projekata koji dopuštaju projektima iz oblasti novih medija i novih tehnologija da se kvalifikuju. Dok je podrška razvoju informacionih i komunikacionih tehnologija velika, veze sa sektorom kulture još uvek nisu uspešno ostvarene. Razvoj održivih programa od strane internacionalnih pomagača i onih koji finansiraju je veoma težak i umnogome neuspešan i za sobom ostavlja brojno 'daj mi' društvo umetnika koji su primali podršku u vidu obuke, tehnologije pa čak i finansija, a koji su od kada su fondovi prestali da ih finansiraju, sada ostali bez podrške. Kako je veza između kulture i tehnologije nova u ovom kontekstu, stvaranje programa koji se ne čine nametnutim, već potrebnim lokalnoj vladi, je teško. Edukacija o važnosti kreativnog bavljenja tehnologijom i zajedničko učešće u tome sa tehničarima, publikom i onima koji se bave razvojem je ogroman izazov, posebno zbog toga što je tehnologija postala izuzetno popularna. Na primer, dosta sajtova afričkih umetnika je razvijeno tako da profiliše umetnika, kako bi se Internet i mogućnosti koje tehnologija pruža predstavili lokalnim umetničkim zajednicama. Kako ovo ne predstavlja digitalnu umetnost kao takvu, koristi se kao prvi korak u usmeravanju pažnje na odnos između tradicionalne umetničke prakse i savremenog medija. Ovo je podiglo nivo očekivanja unutar umetničke zajednice, jer su umetnici sada u mogućnosti da prodaju svoj rad putem mreže, a strani kustosi mogu lakše doći do njih, što je pogrešna predstava o Internetu, koja je u drugim industrijama proizvela slom dotkom-a (*.com). Za mnoge lokalne producente ovo upoznavanje sa odnosom umetnosti i tehnologije je razočaravajuće.

Dok se veza između informacionih tehnologija i obrazovanja od strane nekih lokalnih vlada prepoznaje kao vredna, veza između sektora kulture i novih tehnologija ne zauzima visoko mesto na listi prioriteta. Ovo bi međutim trebalo da ohrabri praktičare i organizacije u razvijanju pristupa pomoću kojih će uposliti postojeće veze sa sektorom informacionih tehnologija, povezati ih sa drugim sektorima i razviti odnos među njima. Tako, na primer, obrazovanje u oblasti umetnosti se može dalje razvijati kroz odnos sa novim tehnologijama, na taj način prezentujući i ohrabrujući vezu između sektora kulture i informacionih tehnologija.

P: Da li u Africi postoji kritički pristup medijskoj umetnosti i novim tehnologijama?

O: Teorijska razmatranja i samorazumevanje umetnosti novih medija jedva da je prisutno u akademskim institucijama, umetničkim zajednicama, ili kod publike. Dok debata o digitalnoj podeli traje, malo napora se ulaže da se ona proširi do nivoa kulturološke intervencije putem digitalnih medija, koristeći se virtuelnim platformama i medijima. Nedovoljno razvijena infrastruktura ima snažan uticaj na efektivnu komunikaciju i razmenu unutar regiona, kao i na promišljanje i interakciju sa međunarodnom mrežom.

Predloženi i postojeći digitalni projekti lako podležu kritičkom sudu, ukoliko se medij ne bavi kontekstom, a u isto vreme su publici teško razumljivi. Može se reći da se ovo verovatno odnosi na većinu konzumenata digitalne umetnosti, kao i na njene kritičare, ali ipak sa posebnom pažnjom treba posmatrati sredinu u kojoj su pismenost, znanje i uopšte izloženost takvim dešavanjima ograničenog karaktera.

P: U trenutnom razvoju tkzv. informacijskog društva, Afrika se smatra očiglednim primerom digitalne podele...

O: Digitalna podela je veoma jasno uočljiva u svakodnevnim susretima sa lokalnim zajednicama. Praktična znanja i resursi ni izdaleka nisu deo svakodnevice. Ipak ja se veoma često prijatno iznenadim, kada vidim kako ljudi uspevaju da se međusobno povežu alternativnim putevima, kako bi postali deo informacijskog i komunikacijskog čvora (hub). Korišćenje elektronske pošte preko prijatelja, člana porodice, pa čak i kolege sa posla je samo jedan od načina komunikacije onih koji imaju niske prihode sa ostatkom sveta. Upotreba istog mobilnog telefona pomoću više sim-kartica takođe omogućava ljudima koji finansijski loše stoje, da komuniciraju putem sms-a, prime telefonski poziv, što ih po kriterijumima povezanosti i dostupnosti čini delom digitalnog društva.

Mora se priznati da se u borbi za shvatanjem digitalne podele, javio jedan drugačiji pristup. U cilju prevazilaženja podele, polako se počela obraćati pažnja na posebnost konteksta, da bi se istakla važnost tehnologije, i pronašla lokalno relevantna, alternativna upotreba tehnologije koja bi prodrla u zajednicu i povezala je (a možda je to već i prisutno). Broj umetnika koji se bave radiom, televizijom i mobilnom telefonijom je ograničen, iako su ovo platforme sa najvećim brojem konzumenata.

Dok je radio, kao medij, slabo iskorišćen u umetnosti, u Južnoj Africi postoji velik broj lokalnih radio-inicijativa, a takođe i radio-stanica u okviru studentskog grada, koje se trude da emituju sadržaj koji je u žiži interesovanja njihove publike. Glavni sadržaj lokalnih radio-stanica čini obrazovni program, s obzirom da državni i privatni sektor koristi ove stanice kao instrument za podizanje svesti o problemima kao što su virus nedostatka imuniteta (HIV) i sida. Mnoge stanice, kao što je Alex FM, zadovoljavaju posebne ciljne grupe sa najnižim prihodima, edukujući lokalnu zajednicu kroz stipendije, uz izdavanje manje količine reklamnog prostora da bi se pokrili osnovni troškovi. Ovaj medij se dokazao kao vredan, jer predstavlja efikasan instrument za edukaciju,

promociju lokalnog obrazovanja, ali često na račun umetničkog i alternativnog i kreativnog sadržaja.

Pitanja digitalne podele su postavljena kao cilj o kome se govori na internacionalnim skupovima, sastancima i festivalima, kao i to da je razvoj 'informacijskog društva' od suštinskog značaja za lokalnu zajednicu.

Na žalost, težak je zadatak načiniti ovo društvo značajnim na lokalnom nivou, što predstavlja pravi izazov i šansu za pokušaj razvijanja samoodrživog doprinosa global-noj debati ali sa rezultatima i promenama na lokalnom nivou. Anegdota o ribaru koji koristi lokalni Internet kafe, kako bi saznao kakva je vremenska prognoza pre nego što ode na more, ilustruje činjenicu da informacija mora najpre biti uvedena u zajednicu, da bi im obogatila život. Tek onda je mogu koristiti, posedovati je i na kraju krajeva joj i doprineti.

P: Da li su pravna lica svesna potencijala informacionih tehnologija (IT) u razvoju društva?

O: Dok je industrija informacionih tehnologija postavila finansijske i poslovne ciljeve i strategije, i njoj je bilo potrebno predstaviti alternativne metodologije i pristupe, kako bi uzela u obzir i kontekst zajednice. Razvojno usmerenje industrije IT-a je retko usmereno ka kreativnom angažovanju njihove tehnologije. S obzirom da postoji najveća potreba za socijalnim razvojem koji će se suštinski baviti pitanjima siromaš-tva, zdravlja, bezbednosti, rezultatima političke nestabilnosti, rata itd, inkorporacija IT-a je ograničena u pristupu putevima kulturnog razvoja.

P: Na kojim nivoima egzistira infrastruktura u različitim zemljama Južne Afrike, poput Zimbabvea, Bocvane, itd?

O: Bitno je razumeti da kreativna digitalna produkcija uglavnom dolazi iz urbanih čvorova afričkog kontinenta, gde su sredstva i znanja više dostupna, iako je to još uvek nedovoljno u odnosu na razvijene zemlje. U južnoj Africi, jasno je da je Južnoafrička Republika sredina sa najviše sredstava, i stoga najaktivnija po ovim pitanjima. U frankofonoj regiji u zapadnoj Africi, Dakar se izuzetno brzo razvija. Kako se Internet kafei pojavljuju na sve udaljenijim mestima, a institucije više okreću ka upotrebi raču-nara, tako se i povećavaju mogućnosti upotrebe ovih infrastruktura za umetničku pro-dukciju. Međutim, sama infrastruktura nije dovoljna za produkciju i promociju digi-talne umetnosti i umetnosti novih medija. Obrazovanje je neophodno ne samo zbog sticanja veština, već i zbog lokalno značajne primene ideja i koncepata, pomoću raspoloživih sredstava i izvora prihoda.

U procesu obrazovanja i sticanja veština vezanih za umetničku produkciju, postoje var-ijacije od zemlje do zemlje, dok neke zemlje uopšte nemaju edukativne programe za buduće umetnike. Međutim, očigledno je da se većina edukativnih programa više oslanja na zapadnjački ugao posmatranja umetnosti, nego što se pokušavaju naći lokalna strategija i lokalni načini razvoja i upotrebe sredstava. Često su viđenja umet-

nosti i zanata stopljena u jedno, rušeći nametnutu poziciju umetnika - proizvođača. Isti kompleksni pristup i model možemo primeniti i kada posmatramo infrastrukturu i obrazovanje u okviru novih medija. Udeo i razvoj lokalne zajednice je otežan zbog kompleksnosti poimanja digitalne umetnosti i visoke tehnologije, što ilustruju neki od međunarodnih primera, ako se uopšte i mogu porediti.

Umetnička analiza globalnog kapitalizma

Intervju sa grupom Biro detud, Pariz

Pitanje: U opisu vašeg rada stoji da, na neki način, nastavljate umetničku praksu, vrstu tradicije koja je bila vrlo popularna tokom 70-tih godina i koja je bila posvećena mapiranju finansijskih struktura na nacionalnom nivou.

Odgovor: Činjenica je da su postojala različita istraživanja strukture kapitalizma tokom sedamdesetih godina, kao što su organigrami, koji predstavljaju i vizualizuju veze između vlasnika različitih kompanija u ovom sistemu. Ovakva vrsta istraživanja počela je da nestaje krajem sedamdesetih godina. U međuvremenu, mi smo pratili ovu vrstu studija o strukturama kapitalizma i zainteresovali se da nastavimo pokret. Ali, ono što je za nas bitno jeste imati poglede na istu temu iz različitih uglova, ne samo o veličini kompanije, već takođe i o njenim religijskim aspektima moći, kojima bi se pružio uvid u različite društvene aktivnosti. Postoji ekonomska organizacija, ali je bitno da ona takođe ima institucionalni, pravni, religijski, kulturni, tajni, itd. aspekt. Mi pokušavamo da uspostavimo različite pristupe i poglede, ne obavezno specijalizovane i usmerene na ekonomske i javne organizacije, jer smatramo da postoje veze između različitih grupa moći. Na primer, ako nam je poznat podatak da je neki menadžer radikalni katolik ili da neka kompanija ulaže dosta novca u katoličke institucije i škole, jasno je da veze između ovih različitih društvenih grupa postoje i da one određuju strukturu savremenog kapitalizma.

P: S obzirom na vaš umetnički rad da li možete reći nešto više o trenutnom položaju umetnika i značenju umetničkog rada? Kako gledate na pojave promene značenja umetničkog rada u smeru snažnijeg društvenog angažmana i veće lične odgovornosti umetnika?

O: Naš lični rad se nije puno promenio u tom smislu. Pre nego što smo počeli da izrađujemo mape, radili smo na razvijanju ideja o otvorenosti i odnosu između položaja umetnika i nezaposlenih. Otvorili smo svoj javni prostor, „FreeZone", najpre u Parizu, a zatim u Strazburu. „FreeZone" je bio prostor za eksperiment, otvoren za publiku koja može doći i ostaviti različit materijal i zauzvrat uzeti nešto drugo. Ideja ovakvog prostora nije bila u pravljenju projekta, već više u kreiranju eksperimenta. Ljudi koji su cirkulisali kroz prostor nisu obavezno bili umetnici, već je dosta njih razmišljalo više u društvenom pravcu. „FreeZone" projekat bio je nešto između umetničke i društvene situacije. Zaista je mnogo ljudi prolazilo kroz ovaj prostor i boravilo u njemu da bi videli šta se dešava, što je privuklo i veliku medijsku pažnju. Imali smo dosta diskusija o vrednosti ne samo umetničkog proizvoda, već proizvoda generalno.

Ipak, mi verujemo da je stvaranje razlike između umetničkog, društvenog i političkog delovanja u stvari društvena konvencija. To je igra, a ne neka transcedentalna istina.

Možemo korisiti različite taktike i strategije u ovoj vrsti kategorije, ali ta kategorija nije prirodna. Nečije delovanje može obuhvatati različite domene i to ne vidim kao problem. To je samo pitanje društvenih kategorija. Takođe, sa pacifikacijom umetnosti, umetnici su danas više „racionalni" ili „profesionalni" nego pre. Vrlo je bitno imati jasnu ideju o umetničkim aktivnostima koje su van umetničkog sistema, što nije tako jednostavno. Ali istovremeno, ako nisi deo umetničkog sistema, onda nisi ni umetnik. Moramo razbiti ovaj sistem ili eksploatisati njegove mogućnosti da bi obezbedili novac za produkciju i preokrenuli situaciju u kreativnom smeru. Takav kreativan način razmišljanja je, na neki način, iznad umetnosti i politike i to je vrlo jasno. On je pozicioniran negde između autonomne subjektivnosti i političke autonomije. Takođe, i etičnost je u pitanju, jer umetnici generalno nemaju novca, a žele da budu poznati. To predstavlja svojevrstan način normalizacije. Danas je prisutan princip kolaborativnog, zajedničkog rada, više nego ikada pre. Ranije, u Francuskoj je postojala institucionalna represija kolaborativne prakse, posebno u školama gde su ljudi koji su radili u grupama na kraju morali da rade pojedinačnu evaluaciju.

Postoji vrsta fuzije između institucija i umetničkog tržišta i to je vrlo staro pitanje. Trenutna situacija se razlikuje od tadašnje. Trenutna situacija je da je svaki umetnik u umetničkom sistemu. Mi govorimo dosta o institucionalnoj kritici i došli smo do zaključka da danas više nije efikasno potencirati ovakvu kritiku, jer je to stara taktika koja datira iz 70-tih i 80-tih godina. U tom trenutku bilo je bitno imati institucionalnu kritiku, ali sada je drugačije, jer moramo da budemo mnogo direktniji. Intenzivno razmišljamo o tome dok se bavimo kartografijom i mapiranjem. Na primer, muzej je samo jedan mali deo velikog kapitalističkog sistema i danas je nemoguće ostati samo u njemu. To jednostavno nema smisla.

P: Šta mislite o događajima kao što je Svetski samit o informacijskom društvu (World Summit on the Information Society), održanom u Ženevi i njegovim posledicama? Vi ste bili deo nezvaničnog, tačnije samoorganizovanog skupa oko samita. Da li mislite da oficijalne i često deklarativne konferencije mogu da promene ili čak da unaprede neke aspekte savremenog informacijskog društva?

O: Zvanični samit je privatna stvar. On predstavlja mašineriju legitimizacije. Danas svetom dominira politička moć, novi načini kontrole i nadzora, novi načini industrijalizacije podataka, itd. A samit je organizovan kao promocija novih načina sprovođenja političkih interesa. Postoje različite studije o Internetu, koje ukazuju na to da Internet omogućuje stvaranje i umrežavanje internacionalnih, autonomnih organizacija, što ne predstavlja problem za državu. Ali sada je ova vrsta utopije završena. Danas je moguće sprovoditi efikasnu kontrolu populacije, naročito u zemljama poput Saudijske Arabije, Kine ili Indonezije, gde se Internet koristi kao sredstvo za kontrolu.

P: Deo svog rada ste posvetili istraživanju različitih sistema koji se mogu nazvati sistemima kontrole: projekat ECHELON, GPS, SWIFT sistem, satelitska tehnologija, itd. Da li možemo reći da se ovo informacijsko društvo postepeno pretvara u društvo

kontrole? Da li obični građani koriste samo mali deo mogućnosti tehnologije koji im je dopušten?

O: Vrlo je jasno: informacijsko društvo je društvo kontrole. Jer, postoje i mogu se koristiti različiti podaci o ljudima i stvarima. Na primer, postoji pitanje IP-a (Internet protokol) koji predstavlja osnovu spontane i automatizovane komunikacije na Internetu i sadrži podatke o osobama/objektima. Postoji „makro" i „mikro" kontrola u telu i u infrastrukturi, i postoji interakcija između ova dva nivoa.

Na primer, sistem za kontrolu „Echelon" je samo simptom sistema. Društvo kontrole ne znači kontrolisati svakog kao u staljinističkim zemljama. To nisu savremeni načini kontrole. U pitanju je naučni način kontrole. Statistički, u okviru ukupne populacije zna se koja grupa je devijantna. Takođe, može se dovesti u pitanje to kako populacija može postati produktivnija. U pitanju je precizan sociološki pogled na društvo. Postoji tendencija, na primer, držanja devijantnih grupa van ostatka populacije. Granica, razlika između devijantnih i „običnih" ljudi veoma je mala. U Francuskoj je nedavno organizovano mnogo akcija u podzemnoj železnici protiv sistema reklamiranja. Ljudi koji prave ovakve akcije, tzv. devijantni, ispisuju grafite preko reklama. Ljudi u podzemnoj železnici koji prisustvuju ovim akcijama imaju podeljeno mišljenje o njima. Često se dešavalo da se pokrene diskusija između onih koji prave grafite i ljudi u podzemnoj železnici, i na kraju se dolazilo do zaključka da su i jedni i drugi protiv sistema javnog reklamiranja. Tako da postoji mogućnost kontaminacije pozicije devijantnih. Četvrti put kada se ova akcija održala, policija je intervenisala na veoma brutalan način. Intenzitet policijske reakcije nije bio proporcionalan efektu koji je imala akcija aktivista. To je ono što se obično dešava na uličnim demonstracijama: policija uzima lične podatke od ljudi koji protestuju i šalje ih u bazu podataka. Ovakva vrsta baze podataka sadrži sve informacije: gde, kada i da li je neko učestvovao u različitim političkim aktivnostima. Ukoliko policija to želi, može uzeti podatke i manipulisati njima. U pitanju je klasična politička kontrola. Ali, problem je inter-koneksija, međusobna povezanost različitih nivoa života, jer, ukoliko postoji baza podataka o političkim aktivnostima i ukoliko se ti podaci povežu sa bazom podataka osiguranja ili medicinskom bazom podataka, vrlo se lako može proizvesti nečiji „profil". Ovakav „profil" može biti posmatran sa biološkog i medicinskog aspekta, kao što je tip krvi, i na taj način se mogu definisati različite vrste populacije.

P: Postoje neki komentari vaših mapa koji ih definišu kao suviše „statičnim" za dinamične procese koje predstavljaju. Na vašem web sajtu postoji i nešto što se zove „animirane mape"…

O: To je konkretno bio pokušaj da se napravi neka vrsta video klipa koji je veoma kratak, a posvećen je 11. septembru 2001. godine. To je dekonstrukcija jednog dela mape. Mape obično poseduju veliku količinu informacija, dok ovaj video daje jednostavniji pogled. Reč je samo o jednom delu jedne mape i o samo jednom od načina njenog čitanja. Medijum je mnogo dinamičniji i prilagođen Internetu, jer je u slučaju naših mapa predviđeno da one budu štampane na papiru zbog čega i postoji mogućnost

da ih „skinete" sa sajta i odštampate budući da ih nije tako jednostavno čitati sa samih monitora.

P: Da li objavljujete svoje mape pod nekom licencom: kopirajt (copyright), Creative Commons, kopileft (copyleft)? Koje je vaše mišljenje o sprovođenju zakona o kopirajtu?

O: Ne objavljujemo ih pod bilo kakvom kopirajt licencom, osim ako se štampaju u komercijalnim časopisima punim reklama, jer tada tražimo novac. Ali obično distribuiramo mape besplatno, jer nam je jasno da živimo u kapitalističkom društvu i upoznati smo sa celokupnom situacijom.

P: Kakva je situacija u Francuskoj i Evropskoj uniji u vezi sa zakonima o kopirajtu i intelektualnoj svojini?

O: U Francuskoj su na snazi vrlo stari zakoni o kopirajtu. Ali, uz postojeće anekse zakonima, stari zakoni transformišu se u kopirajt zakone gotovo identične onim u SAD. U pitanju je samo aneks, dodatak, a ne centralni zakon što je na kraju sve ista stvar.

Razgovor vođen u kuda.org, 20. 12. 2003.

Umetnička produkcija i kapitalistički orijentisano tržište

„Hajde da ne pokušavamo da poboljšamo sekvencu u filmu,
već da počnemo sa projekcijom posve drugog filma!"

Intervju sa Marinom Gržinić, Ljubljana

Pitanje: Kako je umetničko tržište u stvari strukturisano u globalnom kapitalizmu? Da li možeš da objasniš veze koje određuju savremeno umetničko tržište?

Odgovor: Ja ne govorim o globalnom umetničkom tržištu, već pre o strukturi umetničkih institucija. U tekstu, koji je napisan pre godinu dana, deo analize su načini kako institucija moderne umetnosti funkcioniše danas, posebno jer se je ona otvorila prema zemljama drugog i trećeg sveta. Interesuje me kritika, ali još više struktura u pozadini tog fenomena, zato pokušam da učinim vidljivim sistem iza toga. Nisam zainteresovana samo za kritikovanje, već i za načine na koje sistem funkcioniše. A taj sistem temelji na načinu kako se umetničko delo prihvata. Zanima me analiza elemenata koji stoje iza umetničkog rada u prvom kapitalističkom svetu, sa ciljem da ono bude prihvaćeno kao najprirodnija stvar na svetu. Važno je znati da iza ove prirodnosti stoji ceo sistem (teorijskih, kritičkih) ulaganja i (ne samo) novca. Novac je od presudne važnosti na umetničkom tržištu, ali takođe i druga ulaganja (teorijska, kritička) u umetničko delo koje tada počinje funkcionirati kao zastupnik jedne celokupne kulture i načina na koji se ona posmatra. Znači ono što se događa je takoreći prenos od kulture kao zajedničkog nasleđa prema ulaganjima u jedan jedini umetnički rad. Ovaj proces se dešava praktično od prvog trenutka osnivanja institucija moderne umetnosti i umetničkog tržišta. To je jedan momenat, a drugi je kako je sa tim promenama u zemljama drugog i trećeg sveta, jer je ovdje na delu drugačiji mehanizam.

Takozvane nove, globalne izložbe, koje uključuju selektovane umetnike iz drugog i trećeg sveta i njihove radove, ili koje su organizovane samo za njih, razvijaju drugačiji sistem. Ovi projekti su dokaz nekih bitnih novih pravaca, koji se mogu smatrati ne samo konceptualnim, već primarno tehnološkim promenama.

Ono što je bitno nije umetničko delo, već tehnika prenosa koja omogućuje reprodukciju. U slučaju umetničkog rada koji potiče izvan prvog kapitalističkog sveta, niti njegova autentičnost, ni njegova auto-generativna sposobnost nisu vrednovane. On je samo tu da ukaže na transfer umetničkog rada u drugi kontekst i takođe, ako opstaje kroz vreme, i njegovu sposobnost da preživi u novom kontekstu. Ono što je važno za ove globalne izložbe je da upotrebe umetničke radove iz drugog i trećeg sveta u procesu kompresije genealoškog vremena, da se na ovaj način to vreme takoreći evakuiše, a rezultat je sanitetsko čisti kontekst koji se potom konstantno može ponavljati odnosno reprodukovati.

Ili da budem još preciznija, vidimo proces kanibalizacije ili vrlo brzog prilagođavanja istorije i specifičnih umetničkih praksi. Ove izložbe su uvele novu formu genealogije, one koja eliminiše „konvencijalno genealoško vreme, red i vertikalnost". Ono što imamo ovde je prebrza istorizacija a celokupnost koja se ovde uspostavlja poništava sledove koji ukazuju upravo na njenu (ne)mogućnost.

Moj rad se sastoji iz analiziranja i imenovanja ovih procesa: kanibalizacija, prebrza istorizacija, evakuacija, itd. Proces njihovog imenovanja je jedna od krucijalnih tačaka bilo koje ozbiljne analize. Moj teorijski rad takođe insistira na ponovnom vraćanju una-zad i promišljanju pozicije nauke u ovom procesu. Danas, nauka i nove tehnologije imaju važne uloge, tako da nije moguće samo pričati o kopiji kao procesu subverzije umetničke institucije kao što je to bilo u 1980-im, već je neophodno okrenuti se pro-cesima koji su mnogo više veštački, kao što su kloniranje i artificijelno brendiranje.

Opet, moje istraživanje i moj način pravljenja analize je, u stvari da pokaže da je ono što je izostavljeno iz umetničkog i kulturnog polja danas (biotehnologija, kloniranje i održivost) upravo neophodno za njegovo stvaranje i održivost.

Predlažem da se promeni celokupna perspektiva odnosa između umetnosti, umetni-čkog rada, umetnika, paradigme kulture, kulturne vrednosti i šablona (template). Ovo nas zaista dovodi do nove definicije prostora. Svi ovi specifični prostori drugog i trećeg sveta nisu jednostavno kopirani, već su danas reprocesovani po parametrima klonira-nja i preduzetničke genealogije.

P: Pričala si o kulturnoj produkciji i kapitalistički orijentisanom tržištu. Da li možeš reći nešto više o intelektualnoj svojini u ovom kontekstu?

O: Takođe, vrlo je interesantno zašto se „kloniranje" može koristiti umesto „kopiranja", i zašto je biotehnologija bitna. Mislim, zbog toga što nas oba pojma vode nazad ideji da je mesto umetničke produkcije danas laboratorij. Danas, mnogo toga što se tiče ge-netike, vestačkog života i svih tih intervencija na telu se dešava u laboratorijama.

Ono što pokušavam da razvijem ovde je zaoštravanje politike reprodukcije u globalnom kontekstu kulture, što rezultira preduzetničkom genealogijom i procesima sličnim klo-niranju. Ovaj specifičan tip kloniranja, koji je čvrsto vezan za tehnologiju, omogućuje kapitalu da ukloni suštinu iz umetničkog rada. Sve to ima i posledice za celokupnu ideju preduzetništva. To je proces lišavanja sopstvenosti koji „paradigmu razlike" treti-ra na drugačiji način i putem drugačijih stega, uticaja i konstelacija; razlike unutar dru-gog i trećeg sveta se posmatraju samo kroz odnose preduzetništva i vlasništva. Izložbe su posedovane i umetnički radovi su brendirani! U svojoj knjizi iz 1997. *Modest Wit-ness @ Second Millennium: Female Man© meets OncoMouse™ Dona Haravej* (Don-na Haraway) opisuje efekat kloniranja isto kao konstrukciju novog srodstva. Ona opi-suje sličnost kao „pitanje taksonomije, kategorije i prirodnog statusa veštačkih entite-ta". A šta su umetnički radovi iz drugih i trećih svetova nego veštački entiteti, polu

klonirani i u procesu nasilne naturalizacije u jedinom „prirodnom i civilizovanom" kapitalističkom Prvom svetu? Ono što je važno razumeti je logika procesa.

Kompanija roditelj je u našem slučaju dobro administriran projekat globalne izložbe koji povezuje brendove i trgovačke marke. Pozivajući se na Donu Haravej, mogu reći da svi ovi umetnički radovi iz drugog i trećeg sveta predstavljaju različite vrste veza, sličnosti i genealogije, koji su uspostavljeni jedino kroz trgovačke marke, brendove, kao svoje oznake. Ovakve izložbe se zato mogu posmatrati kao projekti koji označavaju različite setove odnosa, koji su danas generisani i prouzrokovani smrtonosnim uticajem korporativne tehno-nauke, što radikalno određuje, formira i artikuliše ono što se smatra globalnom kulturom.

Mogu da obrazložim da sve ove izložbe imaju nekoliko očeva (i ni jednu jedinu majku, kao što je to slučaj i sa ovcom Doli) ili vlasnika koji zasnivaju brend. Javlja se specifično obeležavanje kroz brendiranje, koje ustanovljava nove vlasničke odnose. I ova relacija može biti viđena kao zaštita kapitalističkog vlasničkog prava, koje sve više vodi ka privatizovanom vlasništvu različitih javnih projekata, izložbi, itd. Sva ova vlasništva nove očinske figure su prikrivene kvazi bezličnim pravilima, neutralnim principima u javnosti i teškim kritikovanjem privatno, što otkriva kako ovi novi očevi koji se ponašaju kao diktatori, naturaju apsolutno pravo odluke. Većina izložbi nosi ime po ocu-kuratoru!

Takođe je važno reći da danas svi ovi procesi, posebno novi vlasnički odnosi idu u pravcu razdvajanja kreativnosti od otpora. Zato je zaista vrlo važno ponovo spojiti kreativnost sa procesima koji preispituju, ili koji su kritički prema umetničkom sistemu i umetničkim institucijama. Ova dva procesa (kreativnost i otpor) su danas praktično razdvojena kapitalističkom mašinerijom, jer se izložbe suočavaju sa novim vlasničkim odnosima i umetnici, u stvari, postaju brendovi i trgovačke marke. Kao Mekdonalds! Ono što zastupam ovde nema nikakve veze sa sociologijom. Nauprot tome, u stvari je to način promišljanja i reartikulacije celokupne teritorije umetnosti i kulture, i preispitivanja ne samo šta je umetnost, već više od toga, kako je danas moguće delovati u polju umetnosti.

P: Ali, umetničke institucije i umetnički subjekti se menjaju. Da li se nešto dešava u ovom polju sa pojavom Interneta i novih komunikacionih strategija?

O: Mislim da se stvari menjaju. Kao, na primer, pitanje prostora. Pitanje prostora se zaista radikalno menja. Danas, prostor je sve. Ukoliko mislite o teritoriji, ne možete misliti samo o geografiji. Prostor je danas takođe prostor teorije, jer je teorija čista industrija u Prvom kapitalističkom svetu. Ono što želim da kažem je da treba da identifikujemo ove razlike i da ih uključimo u kapitalističku mašineriju. Ako smo „ozbiljni istraživači", i kritički radnici, kuratori, umetnici, naša uloga je da se vratimo unazad analiziranju i da uključimo i druga polja, takođe. Takođe treba da uzmemo u obzir druge nivoe. Ako je modernizam bio trenutak kada je Fredrik Džejmson (Fredrick Jameson) razvio tezu da je sve kultura, danas sve je nauka.

Ova promena je krucijalna. Ovo je najveća razlika. Pre toga, kultura je bila na vrhu i sve je moralo da joj bude podređeno. Zato je Fredrik Džejmson izjavio „Sve je kulturno!" Takođe, to znači da politika je/bila kultura. Ovo se danas promenilo, jer se moralo prilagoditi novim pravilima: novim prostorima, novim teritorijama i takođe novim načinima stvaranja viška vrednosti. Ovo je bazični pokretač kapitalističke mašinerije svakako, i paralelan je sa svojim novo-uspostavljenim vlasničkim odnosima. Danas, glavni imenitelj u društvu je nauka i naučni rad u laboratorijama, zajedno sa novim tehnologijama. Ovo je razlog zašto govorimo o kloniranju u smislu umetnosti i kulture i genetske paradigme kulture.

P: Ne smemo zaboraviti da je sve ovo povezano sa nematerijalnim radom i da je ova performativnost stvorena i eksploatisana kao oblik nematerijalnog rada.

O: Saučesništvo u teoriji je krucijalno, jer samo neki pisci i kulturni producenti imaju pravo da ustanove nove interpretacije. Centar /prvi kapitalistički svet/ je onaj koji stvara i, u stvari, uzima za pravo da postavlja interpretacije drugih svetova. Namera je da se proces teorijskog pisanja i njegovog saučesništva posmatra iz pozicije moći. Možemo detektovati dijalektički proces između tehnologije pisanja i politike objavljivanja. Teorija i industrija teorijskog pisanja su precizne piramidalne konstrukcije, pažljivo čuvane. Ko može da objavi nešto, gde i u koje vreme, uz to, ko će dati prvu liniju interpretacije, su vrlo važne odluke u kapitalističkoj mašineriji. Ogromni simpozijumi, seminari i paneli su organizovani da podrže svetske izložbe i globalne kulturne projekte, tako da bi oni uvek omogućili cirkulaciju istih teorijskih ličnosti i kreatora javnog mišljenja, i predstavili reprodukciju kapitalističke mašinerije u teorijskom smislu. Ono što želim da kažem je da je nematerijalni rad, u stvari, ovo što mi sada radimo. Mi sada slobodno razmenjujemo mišljenja, kao prijatelji. Ali uskoro, ovo će biti nešto što će apsolutno biti absorbovano u različite nivoe i kapitalizovano u kapitalističkoj mašineriji, dok ćemo mi biti izostavljeni.

Ono što je ovde u ulogu je pitanje šta se računa kao političko, a šta kao tehničko. Želim da budem vrlo precizna ovde: želim da istaknem mesto teorije, jer je vrlo bitno ne zaboraviti nečije saučesništvo u aparaturama isključivanja i uključivanja koje su konstitutivne za ono što se može smatrati teorijom/tehnologijom pisanja i politikom objavljivanja. Poreklo je vrlo bitno, kao i srodstvo. Kao što je Dona Haravej naglasila, samo neki „pisci" imaju semiotički status autora bilo kog teksta, kao što samo neki akteri i „agenti" imaju status vlasnika i izumitelja.

P: Hajde da se vratimo na pitanje kulturne produkcije. Kako je odbaciti, kako je izbeći i da li je moguće pričati o tome uopšte?

O: Reč „produkcija" takođe mora biti transformisana zbog ranije uspostavljenih relacija sa naukom i tehnologijom. Novi sloj značenja se mora dati ovoj reči post zbog toga je produkcija u stvari „postprodukcija".

P: Da li je ovo pitanje nematerijalnog rada?

O: Na jedan način jeste. Dakle, ova postprodukcija je novi model produkcije. Mi samo ne prevodimo, razjašnjavamo ili samo razmenjujemo, već mi zaista ovo radimo kao performativnu akciju. Dok prevodimo, mi već proizvodimo. Dok pričamo, mašinerija već radi, već je u procesu produkcije. Ovo je trenutak kada se Internet i nove tehnologije mogu posmatrati kao važne alatke alternativnog delovanja, jer se tada momenat posprodukcije koristi na najbolji način. Ne možemo više govoriti o Internetu kao haotičnom prostoru on je baziran na regulativama, zakonima i ekonomijama. Takođe, dešava se dosta neizvesnih situacija, koje kapitalistička represivna mašinerija ne može u potpunosti kontrolisati.

P: U stvari, upravo si pomalo počela da pričaš o ovom pitanju: Šta treba uraditi?

O: Moj predlog je da se lozinka zove „izvan bića". To se odnosi na rad Đorđa Agambena (Giorgio Agamben). U svojoj poslednjoj knjizi Open. Man and Animal (2002), Đorđo Agamben nas, u stvari, upozorava da je možda vreme da insistiramo na razrešenju, ili bolje rečeno, na razdvajanju veza između čoveka i životinja. On predlaže da presečemo veze sa ovom stalnom hibridizacijom. Biti izostavljen iz antropološke kapitalističke mašinerije, i ne biti deo stalnog procesa kapitalističke humanizacije, dakle biti izostavljen iz Bića, je možda jedini mogući način imati biće. Izvan Bića je takođe naslov poslednjeg poglavlja u već pomenutoj Agambenovoj knjizi. Dozvolite mi da sada ubrzam, ali da odem dublje u utvrđivanje priče iza Agambenovog predloženog „izvan bića". Mogu da predložim sledeću tezu. U modernoj istoriji filozofije, tri knjige ili tri načina razmišljanja su označila način razumevanja Bića (Sein), što Derida (Derrida) definiše kao „mi i naš život":

1927. Hajdeger (Heidegger) je objavio Biće i Vreme (Being and Time).
1943. Sartr (Sartre) je objavio Biće i Ništa (Being and Nothingness).
1988. Badiu (Badiou) je objavio Biće i Događaj (Being and the Event).
2002. poslednje poglavlje „Izvan Bića" u već pomenutoj Agambenovoj knjizi.

Agamben je dakle onaj koji nam pribavlja najradikalniju gestu. On nam govori: da bi bili spašeni, mi moramo da napustimo staru kapitalističku antropološku kuću! Izvan bića! Agambenovo „izvan Bića" nije samo jednostavan pokret otvaranja prozora u staroj antropološkoj mašineriji. Važno je razumeti da ovaj pokret nije pokret isključenja; iznenada biti uvučen u neki čudan prostor bez vremena, ili izvan vremena. Izvan Bića jednostavno znači da se otvorimo prema drugoj temporalnosti. Ili, da počnemo sa projekcijom potpuno drugačijeg filma i da ne gubimo vreme, što je Badiu predložio, na redefinisanje jedne sekvence filma, iako bi ona mogla biti početna.

Moja interpretacija je da je Agamben u stvari pokušao da postavi jednu apsolutno drugačiju temporalnost. „Izvan Bića" ne znači da možemo da zaustavimo vreme i prostor, već da pokušamo da pokrenemo paralelne istorije, paralelne prvom kapitalističkom sistemu.

P: Da li mogu postojati autonomne zone u prostoru?

O: Apsolutno. Mislim da su autonomne zone veoma bitne, jer one pokušavaju da razviju nove paradigme prostora i vremena. One ne pokušavaju da budu van prostora, niti da jednostavno otvore prostor (uznemirujućeg) Drugog, već u stvari druge prostore. Ukratko: „Hajde da ne pokušavamo da poboljšamo sekvencu filma, već da počnemo sa projekcijom posve drugog filma!"

Razgovor vođen u Beogradu, 13. 12. 2003.

Borba za očuvanje bazičnih vrednosti Interneta

Intervju sa Sindi Kon, San Francisko

Pitanje: Da li možeš ukratko predstaviti „Electronic Frontier Foundation" i trenutne aktivnosti ove organizacije?

Odgovor: Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) je nevladina organizacija bazirana u San Francisku, u Kaliforniji. Ova organizacija započela je svoje aktivnosti početkom devedesetih godina, dakle, na samom začetku Interneta kakav danas poznajemo. Glavni fokus EFF-a je borba za očuvanje ljudskih prava i sloboda u digitalnom dobu. Neka od polja delovanja ove organizacije su prevencija prava na anoniman govor na Internetu gde su postavili standarde zaštite identiteta onlajn govornika, zatim pitanje slobode naučnog rada nakon donošenja DMCA (Digital Millenium Copyright Act) na pitanje konstantnog nadzora i kontrole Interneta od strane američke vlade, itd. Jedan od glavnih ciljeva ove organizacije je borba za očuvanje slobode govora sa pojavom novih komunikacionih tehnologija koje su ozbiljno ugrožene vladinim i korporativnim interesima. „Electronic Frontier Foundation" zalaže se za očuvanje bazičnih vrednosti Interneta – mogućnosti deljenja ideja i informacija.

Najbitnije aktivnosti „Electronic Frontier Foundation" u ovom trenutku fokusirane su na dve različite stvari: jedna od njih je fokusiranje na promene u zakonu SAD širom sveta nakon 11. septembra, na pitanje elektronskog nadzora, na različite oblike vladine cenzure, na pitanja koja su pokrenuta oko takozvanog rata protiv terorizma i kako one utiču na ljudske slobode na Internetu. Drugi deo aktivnosti fokusiran je na posledice koje imaju zakoni o intelektualnoj svojini na slobode ljudi na Internetu, kao i na posledice koje imaju na inovacije i razvoj tehnologije uopšte.

P: Sa pojavom novih tehnologija pojavio se i veliki broj organizacija koje proklamuju promociju i regulaciju intelektualne svojine. Jedna od njih je Intellectual Property Association (IIPA), privatna asocijacija velikih korporacija u SAD, koji su istovremeno i vlasnici velikog broja autorskih prava za Disney, Time Warner, itd.

O: Postoji mnogo ovakvih asocijacija. Ova specifična, Intellectual Property Association, predstavlja grupu za zaštitu interesa nosioca intelektualne svojine, velikih kompanija industrije zabave i nekih softverskih kompanija takođe. Bazično, to je grupa ljudi okupljena oko zajedničkog interesa. IIPA isključivo deluje da bi promovisala i zaštitila prava ovakvih vlasnika intelektualne svojine. Strana koja obično nedostaje njihovim naporima je shvatanje intelektualne svojine kao balansa, gde nisu u pitanju samo vlasnici, već vlasnici i publika. Vlasnici poseduju izvesna prava i publika poseduje neka prava i tu bi trebala da postoji ravnoteža, koja je uvek ugrožena. Intelektualna svojina se razlikuje od stvarne svojine – oni ne vole ovu činjenicu, ali to je istina. Najjednostavniji način da se to shvati je citat Tomasa Džefersona, jednog od naših osnivača, koji je

rekao da je lepota intelektualne svojine u tome da, kada ti nešto dam, to još uvek imam. Dakle, da kada upalim tvoju sveću svojom, da moja sveća još uvek svetli. To čini intelektualnu svojinu različitom od prave svojine i mi smo je uvek tretirali u skladu s tim. Oduvek smo pokušavali da limitiramo prava vlasnika kopirajta u korist javnog, opšteg dobra i drugih prava, da uključimo fer upotrebu i činjenicu da je to onda deo javnog domena gde je dostupan svima. Ono čemu mi prisustvujemo je pojava brojnih predloga i zakona donetih u SAD i širom sveta, koji utiču na porast interesa i prava nosioca intelektualne svojine, dok prava publike rapidno opadaju. Znači, svako ima pravo da koristi samo izvesne delove. Nedavno sam videla jedan umetnički rad koji je koristio delove govora Džordža Buša o ratu, i to reči kao što su teror, Irak, oružje, koje su isečene, kopirane i spojene u formu umetničkog rada. Da su vlasnici kopirajta to poželeli, ovo pravo, ova mogućnost preuzimanja delova i rekombinovanja u novi umetnički rad, ne bi bila moguća. Zanimljivo je videti kako će nova pravila i novi zakoni uticati na umetničku produkciju uopšte. Ali, nije u pitanju samo umetnost, u pitanju smo svi mi i naša prava koja su ugrožena narušavanjem balansa, koji postepeno postaje disbalans.

P: Postoje slučajevi da su kompanije, vlasnici autorskih prava, jednostavno bankrotirale i da nisu na vreme prenele svoja ovlašćenja, što je u izvesnom broju slučajeva značilo i gubitak prava na reprodukciju zaštićenog dela. Da li to znači da kopirajt može da ugrozi kulturni razvoj?

O: Mislim da može, i to ne samo bankrot kompanija koje su vlasnici autorskih prava. Postoji veliki broj razloga zbog kojih može biti veoma teško pronaći osobu čija vam je dozvola potrebna da bi koristili izvesni rad. U SAD, postojao je federalni slučaj koji je dospeo na vrhovni sud, pod nazivom „Eldred". Neki od ljudi koji su bili upleteni u sam slučaj napravili su listu svih radova zaštićenih kopirajtom i listu onih koji su još uvek u upotrebi. Rezultat je bio poražavajući. Zabrinjavajuće nizak procenat radova pod kopirajtom je u stvarnoj upotrebi, ali i ona sama su „zaključana" – još uvek ih ne možete koristiti bez dozvole. Nosilac kopirajta može biti mrtav ili neko koga je nemoguće pronaći, najrazličitije stvari se mogu desiti. Čak i pronalaženje prava na korišćenje većeg dela snimljene muzike danas može biti veoma teško. Postoji nekoliko setova prava i morate dobiti dozvolu svih, što može biti izuzetno teško. Rezultat toga je moćan zakon koji postoji i koji ograničava pristup ovakvim stvarima. Ljudi ih ne mogu koristiti, ne mogu se igrati njima – one su nepristupačne.

P: Prošle godine, u SAD je podneto niz civilnih tužbi protiv ljudi koji su daunlodovali mp3 fajlove sa Interneta ili delili fajlove putem Interneta. Kakve posledice po ljudske slobode ovako nešto može imati?

O: U SAD, dva dana nakon donošenja ovih restrikcija, podnete su civilne tužbe protiv 261 osobe uz tvrdnju da se radi o nezakonitoj upotrebi dela zaštićenih kopirajt zakonom. Ovo je dramatična, nova taktika muzičke industrije. U prošlosti, uobičajeno je bilo da ako se muzičkoj industriji nije dopala nova tehnologija, a oni mrze svaku novu

tehnologiju, oni bi svoje snage usmerili na kreatora te nove tehnologije. Pokušali su sa primenom te strategije na peer-to-peer tehnologiju, ali su bili prilično neuspešni. Dok su pokušavali da urade nešto sa Napsterom, mnogi drugi su se pojavili i sada imaju mnogo više problema na sudu sa ovom, drugom rundom tužbi, nego što su imali sa Napsterom. Muzička industrija pravi sledeći korak i tuži pojedince-korisnike. Među 261 osobom, tužili su dvanaestogodišnju devojčicu i šezdesetsedmogodišnjeg penzionera – regularne, obične ljude. Mi se danas suočavamo sa ovim neverovatnim tužbama. Sve je to bazirano na tradicionalnom zakonu o kopirajtu. Ne radi se o novom zakonu, već o novoj taktici. Zakon o kopirajtu je prilično ohrabren od strane muzičke industrije. Problem je u tome što je zakon loš i mi moramo da ga promenimo. Ovaj zakon je napisan u vreme kada niko još nije posedovao kompjutere, pre nego što je kopiranje pesama bilo tako jednostavno. Bio je namenjen ljudima koji komercijalno posluju, nikada nije bio namenjen pojedincima koji prave kopije ne zbog profita, što je ono što većina ljudi peer-to-peer tehnologijom radi. Oni ne proizvode nikakav novac, to nije nikakav biznis. Oni jednostavno žele da dele kulturu i da kreiraju opšta dobra. Zakoni se ne uklapaju u ova nastojanja baš najbolje i mi moramo uraditi sve da odbranimo i zaštitimo ove ljude, da im pomognemo, jer ih to može uništiti. Zakoni o kopirajtu su veoma rigorozni. Osoba može biti naterana da plati čak 150.000 dolara po pesmi. Prosečan album sadrži 12, 13 pesama i ako imate samo jedan album, možete se suočiti sa štetom u visini od oko milion dolara. To je potpuno lud zakon! Mi mislimo da je odgovor u razgovoru sa kongresom o prepravljanju zakona. U Americi postoji 60 miliona ljudi koji koriste deljenje fajlova. To je više ljudi nego što je glasalo za predsednika. Ako ovi ljudi zatraže od kongresa da hoće da poprave zakon, jer ga mogu izmeniti, onda je to zakon. U Americi možete prepraviti zakon prilično jednostavno i kongres to radi svake godine. Mi bi želeli da vidimo ovaj proces u celom svetu. Preko 200 miliona ljudi na planeti koristi file-sharing sistem. Mislim da oni treba da vrše pritisak na svoje vlade da promene kopirajt zakone na legalan način, imajući na umu benefit publike i stvaralaca. Postoji veliki broj mogućnosti da se ovako nešto uradi, postoji mnogo stranica na našem web sajtu (www.eff.org) pod nazivom „let the music play", gde smo skupili sve moguće načine koje smo mi i drugi smislili da bi se ovako nešto realizovalo. Postoji mnogo načina. Jedan od njih je da ako svako već plaća svoj ISP za pristup Internetu, plati još 5 dolara više i taj novac odlazi u fond, odakle umetnici mogu biti plaćeni. Ovo je jedan od načina. Postoje mikro isplate kojima se direktno plaća manja količina novca u vidu transfer fajla pojedincu. Tehnologija za ovu transakciju već postoji. Samo je potrebna politička volja naših kretora zakona da nateraju muzičku industriju da prihvati jedan od ovih načina. Ne čak ni da ih nateraju, već da napišu zakon koji će ovi morati da prihvate. Ako pronađemo način da učinimo tehnologiju legalnom, možemo lako generisati mnogo više novca nego što muzička industrija to čini sada. U ovom trenutku, muzička industrija zarađuje malu količinu novca. Bil Gejts sam može kupiti i prodati celokupnu muzičku industriju. Intel korporacija zarađuje mnogo više novca nego cela muzička industrija. Kompjuterske i telekomunikacione kompanije su giganti u poređenju sa malom muzičkom industrijom. Ona ne zarađuje mnogo novca ne zato što ljudi ne vole muziku, već zato što ne prilagođava svoje poslovanje potrebama publike. Oni nas primoravaju da platimo 18 dolara za jednu pesmu koja nam se dopada i za 12 pesama koje nam se ne dopadaju. Mislim da ako

ne primorate ljude da plaćaju 18 dolara za jednu pesmu i date im fer cenu, oni će kupiti mnogo više muzike. U svari, većina ljudi bi želela da kupuje muziku na način na koji plaća pristup Internetu. Plate izvesnu sumu novca svakog meseca i sve im je na raspolaganju. Ali, ne postoje nikakve naznake promena u tom pravcu. Industrija polako počinje da obraća pažnju na ovakve stvari, ali sve što oni izglasaju i proklamuju je strogo kontrolisano i ne-fer prema korisnicima. Mislim da treba da počnu da slušaju svoju publiku i da pronađu način da zarade novac iz potreba publike, pre svega poštujući te potrebe. I ako to urade, zaradiće više novca nego što su ikada pre. Imamo čak i istorijski primer za to: kad je prvi video rikorder predstavljen, filmska industrija je počela da podiže tužbe da bi se ovaj produkt povukao sa tržišta. Smatrali su da će to dovesti do smrti filmske industrije, jer će ljudi imati mogućnost nezakonito da snimaju i kopiraju. Vrhovni sud SAD je rekao ne i nije dozvolio da se napustio ova ideja. I filmska industrija se dosetila: zaradili su veću količinu novca na video kasetama nego ikada pre, a istovremeno je količina novca zarađena na odlascima ljudi u bioskope takođe porasla. Znači nije se desilo to da je video oduzeo nešto filmskoj industriji, već je cela stvar postala mnogo veća. Mislim da se slično može desiti sa muzičkom industrijom, jer mnogo ljudi voli muziku i potrebna im je. Problem koji većina ljudi ima nije da oni ne vole muziku, već da ne mogu da pronađu muziku koju vole na postojećem tržištu. To je problem na kome treba raditi.

P: U SAD postoji „301 watch list US Trade Law" i predstavlja listu zemalja „trećeg sveta" koje su plodno tlo za pirateriju, dakle za nepoštovanje kopirajt zakona, a koje su na listi jer su pod direktnom prismotrom SAD. Na 301 listi za 2003. godinu nalazi se i Srbija i Crna Gora. Kakva je generalna politika SAD prema nerazvijenim zemljama kada je kopirajt industrija u pitanju?

O: Trgovačka pozicija SAD-a je u velikoj meri kontrolisana od strane industrije zabave i dešava se to da oni po celom svetu primoravaju zemlje trećeg sveta, veoma siromašne zemlje, da potpišu ugovore i da kreiraju zakone koji ne donose nikakav benefit ovim zemljama i njihovim građanima. Bazično, oni se staraju da novac siromašnih zemalja dospeva u ruke holivudskih izvršitelja poslova, da bi mogli da kupe četvrtu kuću ili peti automobil ili privatni avion. Apsolutno nije u interesu ovih zemalja da potpišu ove ugovore. Ali, SAD obično saopštava sledeće: ukoliko ne donesete ovaj zakon i ukoliko ne potpišete ovaj ugovor, nećemo više trgovati poljoprivrednim proizvodima sa vama ili nećemo više trgovati tekstilnim proizvodima. Ove zemlje imaju mali izbor. Mislim da je potpuno nerazumno reći siromašnoj zemlji: morate da prekinete svoju trgovinu poljoprivrednim proizvodima sa SAD da bi stali iza svojih kopirajt principa. To nije fer. Mislim da je ovo što SAD radi vrlo ne-fer. Nije fer prema siromašnim zemljama primoravati ih da održavaju Holivud. Kao što znamo, cene većine holivudskih filmova, kada postanu dostupni širom sveta, nisu usklađene sa cenom koju siromašne zemlje mogu da plate. Njihova cena je vrlo, vrlo visoka. Nije nikakvo iznenađenje da ljudi pronalaze svoje načine da plate manju sumu, jer regularnu ne mogu sebi da priušte. Mesečna plata za film nije baš realistična stvar koju ljudi mogu da urade. U izvesnom smislu, nije da zagovaram pirateriju, već mislim da morate posmatrati celu sliku.

Razlog zbog kojeg povlače piratska tržišta širom sveta je, delom, zato što je industrija potpuno nerealistična u vezi sa načinima građenja legalnog tržišta i oni bi trebali da snose izvesnu odgovornost za to. Pretpostavljam da se nešto slično dešava i kada je Srbija i Crna Gora u pitanju.

Razgovor vođen u Lincu, 07. 09. 2003.

Transkripcija intervjua nije autorizovana.

O taktičkim medijima i umetničkoj produkciji

Intervju sa Stivom Kurcom, Critical Art Ensemble, SAD

Pitanje: Možeš li nam reći nešto o tome kako je sve počelo, kakvo ste obrazovanje stekli, iz čega su potekle osnovne zamisli i pod kojim uticajima? Kako je nastala ideja pokretanja ovakve grupe i kakav je njen sadašnji položaj u društvu?

Odgovor: Critical Art Ensemble nastao je 1986. godine, a u obliku kakav nam je danas poznat 1987. godine. U početku je to bila jedna grupa video umetnika koja se zatim širila. U to vreme svi smo bili studenti postdiplomskih studija, svi smo dobijali visoke ocene, ali nismo bili zadovoljni onim što nam je institucija pružala. Učila nas je da se specijalizujemo, da puno radimo, da zaboravimo na svet oko sebe i da se strogo usredsredimo na studije. Činilo se takođe da je i sam koncept studija bio veoma ograničen, bilo da je reč o umetnosti i humanističkim naukama, ili pak o društvenim i prirodnim naukama. Mi prosto nismo osećali da to ispunjava ono što želimo. Znali smo da kao pojedinci nemamo moć da bilo šta uradimo. Ali, kada se okupilo više nas, imali smo dovoljno resursa da počnemo da zastupamo jedno alternativno rešenje. Veliki broj ranih projekata na kojima smo radili bavio se organizovanjem aktivnosti u našem mestu, malom univerzitetskom gradu po imenu Talahasi (Tallahassee) koji se nalazi u državi Florida. Mislili smo da možemo da uradimo nešto drugačije i da nađemo način da izrazimo stvari koje su nas se ticale. Na primer, da nam se omogući da imamo šire okvire za istraživanje, a ne samo da slušamo šta jeste, a šta nije umetnost. Umetnički koledž bio je veoma ograničen i u velikoj meri vođen zahtevima tržišta. Ono što bi postiglo uspeh na umetničkom tržištu u Njujorku, je ono što bi vas činilo dobrim umetnikom. Pošto smo mi tada bili znatno mlađi, veoma smo se brinuli o tome šta ćemo biti u mogućnosti da radimo i šta je zapravo nama na raspolaganju. Većinu vremena su nas učili da ništa nije moguće. Ili pratite kretanje tržišta i nađete svoje mesto ili to postane beznadežan slučaj. Odbili smo da poverujemo u to. Takav stav je doveo do formiranja grupe. Hteli smo da kažemo da je ovo kraj svake individualističke umetničke karijere, jer to neće funkcionisati. Da moramo izgraditi jednu alternativnu bazu moći. Ako svi u nju uložimo svoje sposobnosti i pamet, snagu i novac, i sve drugo šta nam je zajedničko, najverovatnije možemo preživeti i sebi izgraditi neku vrstu javne platforme. Polako smo se uspinjali. Nije bilo momenata velikih i neposrednih prodora. Puno smo učili kroz taj posao, jer nije postojalo ni jedno drugo mesto za to. Morali smo da ga učimo stvarajući ga.

Druga stvar bilo je pitanje aktivnosti. Osećali smo da je autoritet američkog stila, „prijateljski fašizam", toliko snažan, da je to primarni elemenat kulture na koji moramo reagovati. Nismo ga mogli ostaviti na miru i pretvarati se da ne postoji. I ta posebna tema, oblikovanje sopstvenog života i odbijanje svega što želi to da nam oduzme institucija, kultura, klasa ili bilo čega drugog, držalo nas je zajedno, uprkos činjenici da smo pohađali različite discipline i da smo dolazili iz različitih krajeva zemlje. Svi smo

mogli da se saglasimo po tom pitanju i da kreiramo sopstvenu praksu kao sredstvo za preživljavanje te vrste autoritarnog nametanja.

P: Da li je tokom vremena dolazilo do izvesnih promena u strukturi grupe?

O: Bilo je promena. U toku prve godine nismo zapravo znali šta je to što radimo, pa i nismo bili veoma uspešni. Počeli smo sa sedmoro ljudi, od kojih je petoro napustilo grupu nakon prve godine. Tako smo ostali samo Stiv Barns i ja nastavljajući posao. Onda smo dobili pojačanje od četvoro ljudi koji su bili sa nama do 1993. godine. Ovo je nešto što ljudi zaboravljaju pri formiranju grupa. Misle da će nešto biti samo radna grupa, ali to nije tako. Morate biti sposobni da izađete na kraj sa karakterima ostalih ljudi. Mora postojati neka vrsta iracionalnog odnosa među članovima grupe koji međusobno osećaju solidarnost iznad samog posla ili to sve ne može funkcionisati dugoročno.

P: Kakav je u ovom momentu tvoj položaj? Da li vidiš sebe kao umetnika, predavača, pedagoga, aktivistu, ili se nalaziš negde između?

O: Da, mi smo sve to. Od samog početka nikada nismo verovali u pojedinačnost uloge i smatramo da niko nije samo to. Niko nije to! Ljudi mi prilaze i stalno pitaju čime se bavim. Nekad je lakše reći da si umetnik, jer ne želiš da ulaziš u objašnjavanje rečenice: „Ja sam hibrid" ili „Ja sam stručnjak za taktičke medije" ili bilo koje druge rečenice kojima bi se mogli opisati. Ali, meni je jasno da u životu svi mi igramo različite uloge, da postoji puno različitih sistema znanja sa kojima imamo interakciju, da postoji mnogo različitih metodologija za postizanje stvari koje koristimo u toku života, pa čak i u toku jednog dana. Mi prolazimo kroz tranziciju sve vreme. U pogledu toga čime se bavimo mogu da kažem da sebe ne smatram samo umetnikom. Ne mislim ni da sam naučnik ili aktivista, već da sam neka kombinacija u kojoj se svi različiti elementi ovih raznovrsnih specijalizacija prožimaju. Oni se prožimaju i kroz grupu. Različitih su intenziteta, ali ti intenziteti se sve vreme menjaju u zavisnosti od sredine u kojoj se nalazim. Veoma sam prijemčiv na ono što sredina može da izazove, tako da sam nekada više aktivista, nekada više umetnik, a ponekad više orijentisan ka nauci ili teoriji. To prosto zavisi od mesta na kojem se nalazimo, od toga sa kim razgovaramo, ili problema koji treba u datom momentu da rešimo.

P: A kada govoriš o umetničkoj sredini, kako se osećaš u tom sistemu vrednosti, na posebnoj vrsti globalne umetničke scene? Da li ti se čini da je ona korisna?

O: Sasvim sigurno da je korisna. Izuzetan je način da se izmuze novac iz te mašinerije. Ali biti deo nje je pitanje veoma čudnog odnosa. Subjekat koji pozivaju da bude deo nje, je nešto što ne žele kao deo, ali je on ipak koristan. Znači, nešto privučete, ne dozvolite mu da ostane predugo, a onda ga pošaljete tamo odakle je i došao. Mi obično ne bivamo u njega ukorenjeni, ali prolazimo kroz dosta toga. Tada je uglavnom gostoprimljiv. Međutim, ako u njemu ostanete predugo tako da počinjete da remetite mehanizme institucije, veoma brzo postajete nepoželjni.

P: Da li sebe smatraš nekom vrstom dekora u ovom momentu?

O: Da, pozivaju me, ali postoji razmena kapitala! To je pregovaranje i obe strane se trude da pregovorima izvuku za sebe najveće koristi.

P: Da li učestvuješ u velikim događajima kao što je su izložbe savremene američke umetnosti?

O: Učestvovali smo u nekim većim događajima, ali se trudimo da se distanciramo od njih.

P: Sa informacionom tehnologijom i otvaranjem komunikacionih kanala, postoji dosta očekivanja od ove tehnologije – da će nas ona osloboditi, da će doneti novu demokratiju, da je to nova sloboda i još puno toga. Već sada možemo da vidimo da je veliki broj takvih očekivanja bio pogrešan. Da li misliš da ova informaciona tehnologija još uvek ima moć i dovoljno energije da proizvede promene u društvu ili ne?

O: Pre svega, takva očekivanja su uvek fabrikovana. Svaki put kada se pojavi nova tehnologija, uz nju dolazi i serija obećanja koja nikada ne budu ispunjena. Ali na taj način fabrikanti najviše profitiraju. Počeli su sa rečima kao što su: oslobođenje, sloboda, demokratija, nova zajednica, itd. Ovo su standardna obećanja koja se zapravo nikada ne ostvare. Dobar deo našeg rada devedesetih godina bavio se sa nečim što otprilike odgovara ovim parolama: „Ne veruj u ovo! Ne veruj u ovu napumpanu priču!" Nismo mislili da se ništa dobro ne može desiti, nego smo zapravo verovali da nije verovatno da se desi zbog načina na koji su se grupisale tržišne snage. Mislim da ne postoje opcije da odgovorim na vaše pitanje da upotreba tehnologije može izazvati duboku pozitivnu promenu u društvu u pogledu kvaliteta u slobodi izražavanja. Ne mislim da će ikada biti revolucionarna. Ne mislim da će se desiti, ali to ne znači da je potpuno prazna. Postoji još uvek mnogo stvari kao što su subverzivno ponašanje, privremene autonomne zone i slobodne situacije koje iz toga mogu proizići. I samo treba da pogledamo istoriju da vidimo da je u nekim vremenima bilo bolje nego u drugim. I kao što Gi Debor (Guy Debord) kaže: „Najvažnija osobina revolucionara je strpljenje!" tj. znati kada je došao momenat i onda delovati. Stvari su većinom loše, ali to ne znači da čak i u najgorim totalitarnim situacijama ne može postojati zdravo podzemlje i zdravo mesto gde se sprovodi subverzija. To takođe ne znači da neće doći momenat kada stvari mogu postati mnogo bolje i da se lična autonomija ne može iznenada proširiti. Da završim aforizmom: „Pesimizam uma, optimizam volje". Mislim da je to bitka u kojoj se vredi boriti. Ona nija prazna i još uvek nije izgubljena.

P: Da li misliš da je tehnologija imala prirodnu šansu da promeni sredinu? To znači da ako imate komunikaciju, ako imate tehnologiju, imate znanje o tehnologiji (naročito digitalnoj tehnologiji), imate i sposobnost da izgradite svoju slobodnu sredinu i da je menjate. Ne znam da li možemo precizno identifikovati istoriski momenat kada se promena desi. Možda je ta šansa još prisutna?

O: Još uvek je prisutna.

P: Postoji jedna stvar u vezi sa tehnologijom. Tehnologija je uvek jedan korak ispred. Uvek ide samo dalje i dalje. Sistem samo može da prati tehnologiju, jer je tehnologija uvek nova. U početku bilo kakvog napretka tehnologije, mali broj ljudi je upoznat sa novim stvarima. Sve drugo, osim tehnologije, lako se inkorporira pravo u sistem koji je sporiji i u kom možete biti smešteni u hijerarhiju, itd. Uzmite univerzitet kao primer sistema, a univerzitetske profesore kao nosioce moći unutar njega. U bilo kojoj nauci kao što su humanistika, društvene nauke, hemija, arhitektura, itd. univerzitetski profesor je zaista moćan, jer postoji čvrsta, stabilna i utvrđena hijararhija. On može da odlučuje šta i ko može da se penje na lestvici, a šta i ko da se spušta. Ali, u informacionoj, digitalnoj tehnologiji, veoma mali broj profesora može da prati razvoj. Oni zaostaju zbog brzine promena, tako da imaju manji uticaj na istraživanje i istraživače. Tada imamo, ili jedva imamo, slabu hijerarhiju koja se stalno menja.

O: Da, ali postoji toliko mnogo nivoa koje vi primenjujete na ovom pojedinačnom slučaju. Teško je reći. Prvi nivo je da je tehnologija u određenoj meri nova. I niko zapravo ne zna kako da je usmeri da radi u interesu jedne određene grupe. To je odlično vreme; jedan od onih momenata kada subverzivne aktivnosti mogu imati dubinsko dejstvo. Ne znam da li će trajati. U pogledu Interneta, subverzivne aktivnosti u nekom smislu slabe u ovom momentu. Ali, ranih devedesetih, on je dobro funkcionisao pre nego što je shvaćeno kako zakoni o svojini i razni drugi zakoni mogu biti iskorišćeni da se uguši otpor. Ali, sada se to kreće u drugom smeru. U isto vreme postoji i dosta konfuzije. Stara industrijska elita ne želi da ode bez borbe. To danas možemo videti u Americi. Ono što se sada dešava je pokušaj stare industrijske klase da ponovo uspostavi primat u svetu. Za proizvođače je nafta, a ne kontrola informacija, osnovna stvar. Vodi se vrsta bitke između virtualne klase i stare industrijske klase. Sukob je još u toku. U toku perioda konflikata, bilo je dosta prostora za subverzivno ponašanje. To se još uvek nije ukorenilo. Zakoni su napisani, protokoli su na mestu i postoji konačna hijerahija u lancu komande koja vlada prostorom komunikacije. U isto vreme još uvek se vodi borba, a u toj borbi postoje načini da se nastupi i postigne efekat. A što se tiče sirotih univerzitetskih profesora… Ne znam da li su ikada bili toliko moćni ko što ih vi opisujete. Oni su se silom prilika našli u ovoj situaciji, naročito u pogledu tehnološkog razvoja.

P: Oni su ovde veoma moćni, možda čak to možemo reći i za Evropu uopšte.

O: U Americi nisu toliko, jer su im vezane ruke zbog toga što moraju da traže novac kako bi istraživački centri mogli da rade. Niko im neće dati novac ukoliko ne pokažu kako će se taj novac vratiti. U osnovi oni imaju ograničenu moć. U tom kontekstu oni mogu da kažu šta je znanje, a šta nije. Ali se sve svodi na to da ako ne mogu da sastave institut koji će donositi profit ljudima koji su u njega investirali, oni neće biti primarni istraživači na duže vreme. Biće otpušteni ukoliko ne odgovore na te zahteve. Oni nisu u potpunosti slobodni akteri. Iznad njih je klasa kojoj moraju da polažu račune, a to je dnevna borba za opstanak. To je jedna od najtežih profesija, jer moraju da polažu račune ljudima koji obezbeđuju sredstva za te neverovatno skupe inicijative.

P: To je tako zbog dobro razvijenog američkog sistema koji je u veoma velikoj meri usmeren ka tržištu i to u materijalnom smislu. U Evropi je profesorsko mesto mnogo sigurnije. Kada neko postane profesor, on/ona ima sigurnost do kraja života.

O: Pa, možda imate siguran posao, ali je to daleko od pozicije moći. To su dve različite stvari. Isto je i u Americi. Ako ne uspete kao naučnik i dalje zadržavate pravo na zvanje i mesto koje imate, ali vam više niko ne daje novac. Jednostavno vam daju da predajete brucošima i to je vaš posao. Bićete gurnuti na marginu, ali ćete zadržati posao.

P: Kakvo je tvoje iskustvo na mestu predavača?

O: Biti profesor? Predajem u Bafalu. Počeo sam na Karnegi Melon univerzitetu (Carnegie Mellon University), koji je u velikoj meri usmeren ka informatici, robotici i tehničkim naukama. Moje iskustvo na tom univerzitetu je bilo veoma loše. Od kako sam kročio u univerzitetski grad pokušavali su da mi daju otkaz, tako da je bilo prilično naporno. Da, na kraju sam dobio zvanje, a onda sam dao otkaz. Oni su se plašili da nisam potpuno posvećen univerzitetu, jer su korporacije i vladine službe koje su finansirale univerzitet saznale o onome što sam radio u to vreme. Plašili su se da će ostati bez donacija.

P: Znači, radi se isključivo o novcu.

O: Skoro. Kada ste pomenuli da istraživanja u sferi tehnologije uvek prednjače u odnosu na sistem, mogu da kažem da su ona uvek za korak ispred. Sistem određuje u kom će smeru ići istraživanje. U Americi, istraživanja mogu da se izvode samo ukoliko dobijete određenu sumu novca. Ko vam daje novac? Vlada i korporacije. Što se tehnologije tiče, to se uglavnom dobija od vojske. Znači, profesori zaista ne mogu da mrdnu. Po mom mišljenju, njihova je moć, ako se to tako može reći, u sferi pedagogije. Oni studentima mogu da ponude model po kom se nešto što ste naučili može koristiti u druge svrhe, ali malobrojni su profesori koji imaju želju i motiv za tako nešto. Tako je njihova uloga i u tom smislu veoma je mala. Na Karnegi Melon univerzitetu to je bilo krajnje očigledno, jer njih u najvećoj meri finansiraju korporacije. To je slučaj sa većinom tehničkih fakulteta. Ovaj univerzitet je bio orijentisan ka praktičnim primenama. Tamo su u najvećoj meri zastupljene dve oblasti: tehnologija i umetnost. To je vrlo čudno. Međutim, imali su i društvene nauke, ali im to nije bila jača strana. Početkom šezdesetih, američka vlada je konstatovala da univerzitet nije u stanju da proizvodi radnu snagu dovoljno brzo da bi se zadovoljile potrebe na polju tehnoloških istraživanja. Gomile para su upumpane u MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Carnegie Mellon University i California Institute of Technology kako bi vlada bila sigurna da će se vrhunske tehnokrate izbacivati na tržište dovoljno brzo.

P: Vratimo se na teorijski, kritički nivo. Kako se osećaš kao kritičar kulture u sadašnjem istorijskom momentu kada se istorija menja veoma brzo? Napisali ste članak „Elektronska građanska neposlušnost" koji ste objavili 1995. godine. Da li ste od tog

momenta do sada osetili neku promenu koja bi se ticala odnosa tog članka i okruže-
nja?

O: Smatram da to još uvek može da funkcioniše kao društvena kritika. Mnogo teže ide
primena takvih teorija. Dopušteno vam je da teoretišete o čemu god hoćete. Problem
nastaje kada neko to pokuša da primeni. Ne, ne mislim da je u ovom trenutku nešto
teže. Sve je u redu ako ostajete u domenu obrazovanja, pedagogije i teorije. Ako
počnete nešto da primenjujete, onda nastaju problemi.

P: Da li ste pokušavali da primenjujete ideje iz tog članka? Da li ste imali problema
sa zakonom zbog problematičnih tema obrađenih u njemu?

O: U „Elektronskoj građanskoj neposlušnosti?" ne. Kao što se u članku i kaže, mi ni-
smo imali tehničkih mogućnosti da ga primenimo onako kako smo to zamišljali. Mnogi
ljudi su jednostavno preuzeli model i primenili ga. To smo tamo i predočili oni koji ima-
ju tehničke mogućnosti i upoznati su sa modelom će ga i primeniti. To se u izvesnoj
meri i desilo. Ono što smo mi tada predlagali danas predstavlja težak prestup na držav-
nom nivou zbog kog bi neko ležao u zatvoru veoma dugo, iako nije ništa uradio. Sum-
njam da bi danas neko uradio tako nešto. Smatram da su ljudi koji se bave ekstrem-
nim vidom hakerisanja, kao što je pomenuti, kriminalci. Sa zakonom smo imali prob-
lema zbog onoga što smo radili, a imalo je veze sa medijima. U virtualnom svetu ni-
smo imali problema. To nije imalo veze sa digitalnom tehnologijom. Probleme sa za-
konom smo imali zbog onoga što smo radili na ulici. Ponekad nismo imali nameru ni
da pravimo probleme, a pravili smo ih.

P: Kakav je tvoj stav prema novoj levici iz ranih šezdesetih i danas? Kako uopšte gle-
daš na levicu? Žižek na primer piše da levica ne nudi viziju napretka i optimizma i
da je to razlog zbog kog desničarske ideje i stranke jačaju, postaju sve više vidne i
bliže ljudima u Evropi. Levičarske ideje više nemaju svežinu i čini se da je to jedan
od glavnih problema.

O: Nisam siguran da se u potpunosti slažem sa tim. Nova levica je u izvesnom smislu
bila inspirativna. To je bio prvi talas ozbiljnog oponiranja. Oni su uspeli to da prošire
na šire narodne mase. Mora im se odati priznanje za to, naročito s obzirom na to da
se to dešavalo u posleratnom periodu. Konačno, oni su opstali, jer su reagovali na
okruženje koje se drastično menjalo. Takvi događaji su bili veoma važni za ono što mi
radimo, ne zato što smo kontramarksisti, nego zato što su oni shvatili da ako neko želi
da se bavi tom vrstom kulturološkog/političkog otpora, da onda to ne sme da se za-
ustavi na nivou projekta. Mora da postoji i teorijsko utemeljenje, kao i jezik kojim će
se artikulisati ono što radite. To je jedna od stvari koju smo na samom početku shva-
tili kao nešto veoma važno. Osvrnuvši se oko sebe, videli smo da niko to nije arti-
kulisao. Svi su se bavili ili teorijom ili projektima. Imali smo utisak da nova levica pre-
zire našu praksu, da nas je odbacila, i shvatili smo da nam je upravo to bilo potrebno
da bismo ponovo oživeli. U tom smislu, ja gajim simpatije prema njima. Smatram da
su na razne načine bili inspirativni. Ako uzmete u obzir kontekst, njihov rad je u tom
trenutku bio veoma bitan. A zašto desnica ima više uspeha? Da li je to možda zbog

pogrešnog ugla u koji je levica samu sebe saterala ili zato što ne znaju šta će sa kategorijom utopije? Oni su svesni da je ne mogu imati, jer ona ima tendenciju da bude uopštena. Uopštavanjem se automatski isključuju ljudi, a to nije ono što bi levica želela. Oni žele sveobuhvatan, višedimenzionalni pokret pravi narodni front. Istovremeno, oni koji nemaju čvrstu poziciju moraju imati jasnu viziju cilja, jer će neko drugi, kao na primer desničari, doći i reći: „Ovo hoćemo. Hoćemo nacionalni ponos, napravićemo ovakvu državu!" Levičari ne žele da istupaju sa takvim izjavama i, u izvesnom smislu, ne bi ni trebalo. To je sukob između teorijske pozicije i etičkih principa, s jedne strane, i prakse, s druge strane. Do sada još niko nije smislio način da se taj sukob reši.

P: Kada pričamo o vidljivosti, postoje popularni levičarski likovi. Nedavno sam gledao filma „Žeđ za nasiljem" (Bowling for Columbine) režisera Majkla Mura (Michael Moore). Generalno se smatra da film ne pogoduje sistemu jer se bavi „veoma problematičnom" tematikom, kao što su puške u prodavnicama, nasilje u školama, NRA, itd. Međutim, ponekad mi se čini (ti se možda nećeš složiti sa tim) da je to vrlo uprošćen zaključak. Ja mislim da sistem hijerarhija računa na likove kao što je Mur, da su oni deo sistema. Na neki način, sistem ima kontrolu nad njima. Balibar kaže da se vladajuće klase održavaju na položaju usvajanjem ideja iz „podzemlja". To je, da kažemo, model po kom je Rimska imperija prihvatila hrišćanstvo. Šta ti misliš o tome?

O: Pa, trenutno smo svi deo sistema. Smatram da u tehničkom smislu to svi možemo da prihvatimo. Kao što ste malopre konstatovali, dešava se da se pojavljuje nešto novo, što se još nije učvrstilo u određenim strukturama moći nije se pretvorilo u tu vrstu singulariteta. U tome može da postoji izvesna doza avangardizma, ali u smislu da postoji neko ko izlazi iz okvira sistema i u stanju je da vidi „nove horizonte". Što se tiče pitanja o optimizmu, mislim da u levici ima optimizma. Problem je u tome što on nije usko određen. U mnogim delima, bila to Imperija (Empire) autora Hardta i Negrija (Hardt, Negri), ili pak u nekim drugim delima možemo da pročitamo sledeće: „Pa, vidite, postoji taj plan mogućnosti, a na tom horizontu postoje alternative." Ljudi to čuju i kažu: „Sjajno, ali šta to znači?" Za nekoga ko se ne slaže sa idejom neodređenosti kao uporišta otpora i optimizma, to nema nikakvog smisla. Tu zaista nastaje problem. Desnica ima plan koji je vrlo jednostavan. Poruka Majkla Mura je vrlo nejasna. Tip ne zna šta hoće. Ali, uvek će biti popularnih političara iz redova otpora. Mene raduje što postoje likovi kao što je Majkl Mur, ali istovremeno osećam problematičnu stranu svega toga, jer njihova argumentacija nije konzistentna. Njen veliki deo čini emocionalni naboj što ne mora da bude od naročite koristi, ako se gleda na duže staze. Kratkoročno gledano, to vrlo dobro funkcioniše, ali u dugoročnom smislu, koncepcija se vrlo brzo razotkrije.

P: Još jedno pitanje o specijalizovanosti u takozvanoj digitalnoj sferi. Trenutno, u svim sferama postoji veoma veliki broj specijalizovanih stručnjaka koji međusobno ne komuniciraju. Da li misliš da se problem, kao što je nedostatak društvene kritike ili subverzivne delatnosti, temelji na specijalizovanosti? Drugi deo pitanja bi bio da li misliš da nam predstoje nove „generalizacije", tj. da li će ponovo biti ljudi koji će

se razumeti u probleme iz raznih oblasti? Na kraju, da li misliš da je pitanje speci-
jalizovanosti jedan od glavnih problema (na primer, u opštem stavu prema znanju) i
da li veruješ da je mogućnost da se u jednoj osobi skupe raznovrsne „vrline" – neka
vrsta renesansnog modela koji nas očekuje u budućnosti?

O: Pomalo smo pisali o tom problemu. Mi na specijalizovanost gledamo kao na struk-
turalni problem. Ona je osnovni uzrok otuđenja. Ona je ugrađena u sistem i upravo u
tu svrhu je ojačana i intencionalizovana. To je jedan od načina na koji je prosvetitelj-
ski model upravljanja znanjem doprineo održavanju određene vrste poretka. To je bila
ključna stvar u tom procesu. To je deo razloga zbog kog smo mi iskoračili iz tog mode-
la. Što se tiče pitanja da li je moguća pojava renesansnog čoveka koji će biti u kontak-
tu sa problemima iz raznih oblasti, moj odgovor je ne. Mislim da je u ovom momentu
to isuviše komplikovano. Ono što je moguće i za šta se zalažemo je amater koji će ko-
municirati sa stručnjacima iz raznih oblasti. Loša strana ove zamisli je to što je reč
amater uvek korišćena sa značenjem pripadnosti ili nepripadnosti određenoj disciplini.
Njome su se nazivali ljudi koji žele da pobegnu iz okvira specijalnosti, jer im ne pri-
padaju. Ali, smatram da je vreme za revoluciju u kojoj ćemo se prebaciti na drugi mo-
del u kom osoba renesansnog tipa može da se pojavi u ekstremno složenoj situaciji u
kojoj trenutno živimo. Mi se definitivno borimo za povezivanje raznih segmenata stvar-
nosti. To se ne može raditi sa pozicije eksperta, nego sa pozicije uljeza, tako da mo-
žemo da gledamo njihovim očima, da u okviru usko specijalizovanih oblasti postav-
ljamo pitanja koja se inače ne bi postavljala, da proizvodimo određeni efekat i da hib-
ridna uloga stvara veze o kojima je reč. To je sasvim novo shvatanje amatera. Osim to-
ga, to nije „osobenost individue", nego „osobenost grupe".

P: Kada biste želeli da popričate sa nekim stručnjakom iz strogo specijalizovane in-
dustrije, bilo bi vam teško da objasnite čime se bavite jer on/a ne zna šta je važno
na globalnom planu. Da li mislite da je potrebno uvesti novu vrstu obrazovanja za
eksperte koja će im predočiti globalne probleme, globalnu situaciju, pomoći im da
prepoznaju svoju ulogu u celoj priči i, eventualno, da učestvuju u promenama?

O: To već svako zna. Prosvetiteljski model specijalizovanosti je doveo do takvog stepe-
na otuđenja, takvog stepena eksplozije znanja, da struktura ne može više da izdrži
teret informacija koje se proizvode. Na taj način, model propada, naročito zbog rupa
u komunikaciji. Smatram da postoji potreba koju većina profesora i, uopšte ljudi iz ins-
titucija, razumeju, a to je potreba za interdisciplinarnim obrazovanjem. Problem je u
tome što je vrlo teško revidirati institucije. One su napravljene da se ne menjaju i oko
toga se vodi neprestana borba. Ali, bar smo došli do nivoa na kom se upotrebljava je-
zik. Možda primena još ne funkcioniše najbolje, ali postoji mogućnost da će se stvari
pokrenuti u tom smeru.

Razgovor vodili Vladimir Maruna & Vladimir Tupanjac,
u Novom Sadu, 16. 04. 2003.

Transkripcija intervjua nije autorizovana.

Index autora

Hert Lovink (NL)

Hert Lovink je jedan od najznačajnijih savremenih teoretičara medija i Internet aktivista. Jedan je od suosnivača internacionalne mejling liste „Nettime", koja se tokom 10 godina postojanja proširila i na druga govorna područja (lista postoji na engleskom, holandskom, francuskom, španskom, portugalskom, rumunskom i kineskom jeziku). Član je grupe „Adilkno" (Foundation for the Advancement of Illegal Knowledge), asocijacije koja se bavi fenomenom medija osnovanom 1983. Uređivao je časopis o medijskoj umetnosti „Mediamatic" (1989– 94) i držao je predavanja o teoriji medija u centralnoj i istočnoj Evropi. Su-osnivač je amsterdamske mreže nezavisnih medija „Digital City" i kampanje za podršku nezavisnim medijima u jugoistočnoj Evropi „Press Now". Bio je jedan od organizatora konferencije „Wetware" (1991), „Next Five Minutes" 1–3 (93–96–99), „Metaforum" 1–3 (Budimpešta 94–96), „Ars Electronica" (Linc, 1996/98) i „Interface 3" (Hamburg 95). Organizovao je konferenciju „Tulipomania dotcom" u Amsterdamu (2000), sa kritičkim osvrtom na tzv. Novu ekonomiju. Jedan je od pokretača „Fibre Culture" foruma za Internet istraživanje u Australiji (2001).

Sarai i **Raks medija kolektiv** (IN)

Sarai je program Centra za proučavanje društava u razvoju (Centre for the Study of Developing Societies CSDS) u Delhiju, i osnovan je 2000. godine. Program Sarai-a podrazumeva javni prostor gde različite intelektualne i kreativne energije mogu da se sretnu i reaguju na dinamičan i otvoren način da bi podstakli imaginativnu praksu istraživanja urbane realnosti, stare/nove medijske prakse i kritičke kulturne intervencije. Program Sarai-a je inicirao Raqs Media zajedno sa Ravi Sundaramom i Ravi Vasudevanom (iz CSDS-a) 2000. godine. Raqs se nalazi u Media Lab-u Sarai-a, gde se sprovodi istraživanje i produkcija radova u različitim medijima što podrazumeva instalacije, video, zvuk, fotografiju i tekst.

http://www.sarai.net
http://www.raqsmediacollective.net

Saskia Sasen (NL/SAD)

Saskia Sasen je profesor sociologije na univerzitetu u Čikagu, i gostujući profesor na londonskom ekonomskom fakultetu. Trenutno završava svoju četvrtu knjigu koja nosi naslov „Denacionalizacija: Ekonomija i politika u globalnom digitalnom dobu (Princeton University Press 2003) zasnovanu na petogodišnjem projektu o upravljanju i odgovornosti u globalnoj ekonomiji. Njene novije knjige su „Gosti i Tuđinci" (Guests and Aliens (New York: New Press 1999) i novo dopunjeno izdanje njene knjige „Globalne mreže/Povezani gradovi (Global Networks/Linked Cities (New York and London: Routledge 2002). „Globalni grad"

(Global City) je izašao u novom dopunjenom izdanju 2001. Njene knjige su pre-
vedene na deset jezika. Ona je jedan od direktora na Odeljenju za ekonomiju glo-
balnog čikaškog projekta, član naučnog panela o urbanim podacima Nacionalne
akademije, član veća za spoljne poslove, predsedavajući novoformiranog odbora
za računarstvo, međunarodnu saradnju i globalnu sigurnost.

http://www.law.uchicago.edu/faculty/sassen/

Markus Nojsteter (SA)

Markus Nojsteter se bavi razvojem projekata vezanih za odnos između umetno-
sti i tehnologije kroz formu mobilnih instalacija i Internet radova, koje odlikuje
neprestan protok informacija kroz umrežene platforme. U ovom procesu, bavi se
istraživanjem digitalnih i analognih načina reprezentacije virtuelnih iskustava.
Markus Nojsteter aktivno učestvuje u razvoju platforme za lokalne digitalne pro-
jekte u Južnoj Africi i Evropi, uključujući učešće na događajima kao što su ARS
Electronica (Austrija), Transmadiale.03 (Nemačka) i E-tester (Španija). Lokalni
projekti su fokusirani na produkciju izložbi digitalne umetnosti, treninga, preda-
vanja i seminara. Kao direktor (zajedno sa Stivenom Hobsom) „Sanman" mreže
(Southern African New Media Art Network) i galerije „PREMISES", Markus Nojs-
teter je aktivno uključen u razvoj strategije kulturne industrije, zasnovane na isku-
stvima kulturne i ICT industrije u Južnoj Africi. Trenutno radi na razvoju UNESCO
mrežnog projekta pod nazivom „Digi-Arts Africa".

http://onair.co.za/mn/cv.html

Biro detud (FR)

Biro detud iz Pariza je grupa umetnika koji se bave novim medijima i osnovana
je 1998. godine. Njihov rad se bazira na mapiranju različitih oblika vlasti i mo-
ći, i deo je organizacije iz Strazbura pod nazivom „Université Tangente" koja ist-
ražuje „autonomno znanje". Svojim radom, Biro detud razvija piktografske insta-
lacije koje se bave temama poput mreže sistema za prikupljanje podataka, bio-
ratova i globalnih pokreta otpora. Oni vizualizuju distribuciju moći u svojim
različitim oblicima: političkim, kulturnim i finansijskim, prikazujući povezanost
različitih aktera globalne scene.

www.universite-tangente.fr.st

Marina Gržinić (SI)

Marina Gržinić Mauhler, RhD, istraživač na Institutu za filozofiju pri Naučnom i
istraživačkom centru slovenačke Akademije nauka i umetnosti u Ljubljani. Radi
i kao nezavisni kurator, kritičar i teoretičar medija. U saradnji sa Ainom Šmid, od

početka osamdesetih radi video projekte, kratke filmove, instalacije, web-siteove, knjige i CD ROM izdanja.

www.ljudmila.org/quantum.east/
www.eda.ucla.edu/events/spring01/mauhler/mauhler.htm

Sindi Kon (SAD)

Sindi Kon je pravni direktor „Electronic Frontier Foundation". Ona je odgovorna za nadgledanje celokupnih pravnih strategija ove organizacije. EFF je aktivno angažovana u skoro svim sferama u kojima je izražen uticaj Interneta na građanske slobode. U poslednjih nekoliko godina, EFF se fokusirao na dva glavna izazova prvi je uticaj promena u zakonu nakon tragedije 11. septembra i drugi je izazov koji se tiče prava Internet korisnika nakon nedavnih promena u zakonima o intelektualnom vlasništvu.

http://www.eff.org/

Stiv Kurc (SAD)

Stiv Kurc je profesor na odseku za umetnost univerziteta u Bafalu, SAD. Kurtz ima doktorat iz interdisciplinarne humanistike, i pre nego što je došao da predaje na UB, bio je professor na Karnegi Melon univerzitetu (Carnegie Mellon University). On je jedan od osnivača i članova internacionalne umetničke i teorijske grupe Critical Art Ensemble (CAE). CAE je kolektiv koji čine pet osoba različitih specijalizacija koji istražuju taktičke medije i intersekciju između umetnosti, kritičke teorije, tehnologije i političkog aktivizma. Kolektiv je producirao i izveo brojne projekte za internacionalnu publiku na raznim lokacijama, počev od ulice, muzeja, do Interneta. Critical Art Ensemble je objavio pet knjiga. Njihova poslednja knjiga je „The Molecular Invasion" (Autonomedia, 2002).

http://www.critical-art.net

kuda.org – društvene implikacije novih medija

Centar za nove medije kuda.org je organizacija koja okuplja umetnike, teoretičare, medijske aktiviste, istraživače i široku publiku na polju informacijskih i komunikacij-skih tehnologija (ICT – Information and Communication Technologies). U tom smislu, kuda.org je posvećen istraživanju novih kulturnih odnosa, savremene umetničke prakse i socijalnih tema.

Aktivnost rada kuda.org je posvećena pitanjima uticaja elektronskih medija na društvo, na kreativnu upotrebu novih komunikacijskih tehnologija i na savremenu kulturnu i društvenu politiku. Neke od glavnih tema su interpretacije i analize istorije i značaja informacijskog društva, potencijala same informacije i rasprostranjenosti njenog uticaja na političke, ekonomske i kulturne odnose u savremenom društvu.

Razvoj novih komunikacijskih tehnologija je uslovio brojne promene u savremenom društvu, dotičući se njegovog političkog, društvenog i kulturnog aspekta. Internet, procesi primene novih tehnologija i novih modela komunikacije kroz proces „umrežavanja" i razvoj kritičkog mišljenja prema navedenim, postaju i naša svakodnevnica. Čitav niz istraživača, teoretičara, programera, kritičara i medijskih aktivista, svoj rad posvećuje istraživanju i objašnjenju globalnih fenomena današnjice i njihovih posledica.

Centar za nove medije kuda.org otvara prostor za kulturu dijaloga, alternativne metode obrazovanja i istraživanja. Društvena pitanja, medijska kultura, nove tehnologije umetnost, princip Open Source i Free Software su oblasti kojima se kuda.org bavi.

Programi kuda.org:

kuda.info / infocentar

pruža informacije iz oblasti kulture novih medija, savremene umetnosti i društvenih fenomena; omogućava istraživanja i edukaciju preko biblioteke, medijateke i arhive iz ove oblasti; obaveštava o kulturnim dešavanjima, seminarima i sličnim organizacijama u zemlji i inostranstvu i njihovim programima.

kuda.lounge / prezentacije i predavanja

sastoji se od predavanja, razgovora, javnih prezentacija umetnika, medijskih aktivista, teoretičara umetnosti, naučnika, istraživača i inžinjera; (izložbe, prezentacije, tribine, simpozijumi, predavanja su mesto aktivnog dijaloga i interakcije, koja doprinosi stvaranju novog kvalitetnog jezgra na obe strane: kod publike i predavača)

kuda.production / produkcija i izdavaštvo

obezbeđuje uslove za neprofitno umetničko stvaralaštvo na polju novih medija i tehno-logija; kuda.org kao producent, koproducent pruža uslove za interdisciplinarna istra-živanja i eksperiment.

Centar za nove medije **kuda.org**
Braće Mogin 2, PO Box 22
Detelinara, 21113 Novi Sad
Srbija i Crna Gora
tel/fax: +381 21 512 227
mail: office@kuda.org
url: http://www.kuda.org

Geert Lovink,
Amsterdam

Raqs Media
Collective /Sarai

Saskia Sassen,
Chicago

Marcus Neustetter,
Johannesburg

Bureau d'Etudes,
Paris

Marina Gržinić,
Ljubljana

Cindy Cohn,
San Francisco

Steve Kurtz,
Buffalo

divanik

Conversations and interviews about media art, culture and society

Before us is a collection of interviews conducted in the period from 2001 to 2004 which represents intersection of research in the field of new technologies, culture and society. Interviews present network of people and organizations that make one part of the contemporary media art and theory scene.

New media center kuda.org monitored those phenomena that have interdisciplinary and intermedial character, and by inviting the significant protagonists in media art and theory the intention was to give to the local public an insight at the happenings in this field.

Research of the media is the research of the history of communication, and communication today is a bio-product of the information age, exchange of valuables in the capitalist coordinate system in which the concepts and ideas are treated as meaningful goods and products. On the other hand communication is also a tool that changes the same coordinate system.

As a communication practice the phenomenon of the interview is immanent to Internet culture. Interview represents concise form of communication and it is a useful instrument in the scientific work as meta-text that follows complex theory or artwork. In the interviews authors present contexts in which they were creating and their points of view and this direct communication through the actual questions presents real-time articulated energetic potential. That is also a chance to analyze and restructure certain topics in the form that couldn't occur in theoretic and artistic work. Interview is a sublimation of different aspects, overlapping and interdisciplinarity that at a given moment presents unique thinking system.

The development of information and communication technologies also brought along new social ontology that is manifested in the social, political and culture field. Instantaneity of history, accumulation and pace of technological development stipulates momentary reaction and critical analysis.

The goal of these interviews is to critically analyze and present to the wider audience certain art and socio-political phenomena. Within the kuda.read edition the accent is put on pointing out to the expanded referential system inside the new media and culture that spreads from the marginal social practice to academic theory and scientific research.

kuda.org, 2004.

The End and the Beginning of Creative Use of Technologies

Interview with Geert Lovink, Amsterdam

Question: Do you think that there is a shift going on in terms of art production with the spread and accessibility of communication technologies and new socio-economic conditions?

Answer: If we look at the position of new media art, I think we have seen many shifts over the past decade. In the early '90s, artists still had an avant-garde role, or at least many people saw themselves experimenting with technology that wasn't really used widely in society. Perhaps the same counts for academics. There was certain exclusivity in terms of the use of technology. Not everyone had a computer at home. At that time, artists working with the technology perhaps felt that they were in an exclusive and privileged position to some extent. This changed dramatically, especially in the '90s. The use of technology spread back in the 1980s, if we think about VHS or the rise of satellite technology. But with the rise of the PC, the Internet and the spreading of multimedia devices, we can see an enormous democratization in terms of technology. And this I think has, in the long term, meant that ten or twenty years later, we have to redefine the shift in the position of the art. The artist is no longer in an exclusive position in relation to the technology, so in this sense the artist is just one of many players. There's a very strong emphasis on design in technology. Engineers still play a very important role. I think we can see a shift towards increased critical reflection on the role of technology, so the artist no longer feels that he or she is a sort of first user, who has to explore the boundaries of technology. Many people can buy video equipment, the price of which is in freefall. This also means that the role of new media art is currently shifting towards a more critical approach.

Q: You are one of the founders of the Nettime mailing list. How can you now, after seven years, summarize Nettime's achievements?

A: Nettime was a mailing list, a movement that started in 1995, and it happened in a very specific moment in time, at the height of the Internet boom, when the Internet had sort of shifted from the United States to Europe. It was spreading around the globe very rapidly. Nettime was started as a community and intersection of the different critical practices of artists, activists, designers, programmers, people working with new media, in the emerging new media industry, so to say. Of course, there were also academics involved, theorists and critics, but it was never just theory, never just academic theory. The critical practice was very widely spread. Now, seven years later, Nettime has become much more multilingual. First of all, there are six or seven languages we are dealing with, it's not just English anymore. The latest added to the list are Japanese and Chinese, which gives you an idea of the shift towards Asia, but Portuguese and Spanish have also been added, so we can see growth in various direc-

tions. Our emphasis at the time was very much focused on the region here, on Eastern Europe, but we very well knew that it was going to be much more inclusive in shifting towards other continents. The Nettime community itself has not grown exponentially. It started with a few hundred people, and now there are three thousand. That's not a very high take-up rate. What we certainly can see is that during the dotcom boom in the late '90s, the whole critical Internet practice had to be redrawn. It was not really in a defensive mode, but it certainly got into a very confusing state where the Internet became an enormously hyped up business environment, and our approach could not really respond, simply because of the violence and the speed of the changes. Even there, you could see that we were more and more forced to respond to developments, and as such it becomes more and more difficult for a critical practice to initiate a new direction. And I think that this is one of the more long-term shifts that I see.

Q: Do you think that the economic stability and welfare of a country in terms of developed and implemented Information and Communication Technologies is a necessary pre-condition for the appearance of a critical new media culture?

A: In most cases, in rich countries where there is a lot of Internet use, it doesn't automatically mean that there is a developed new media culture or a critical practice. It usually doesn't work like that. The second country after the United States in terms of strength of users is China. But there is absolutely nothing going on there in terms of developed new media culture. And we can take the example of Japan, where there are millions and millions of users, but very limited critical reflection on the possible impacts of these technologies. The absolute numbers do not tell us very much. If we look at Eastern Europe, or specific countries in Asia, India in particular, if we look at specific cultures, why are these places so interesting? It's not because there are huge IT industries, and because the whole population is already on-line. It is more that there is an enormous drive among young people with a critical understanding, and a very sophisticated visual vocabulary that is shared in a wider community. There is a critical understanding of the importance of culture, that culture has a role to play in the whole network society or in the take-up of technology. I think this is the main thing. And you will find that awareness in many places. It can be found in places like Brazil or India. In New Delhi there is a center called "Sarai", the first new media center in India, it opened in 2001. They're already finishing a lot of projects and events, and they have an emphasis on Open Source and Free Software. They're developing a program which emphasizes the local language, Hindi, spoken by hundreds of millions of people. A language that for some reason is virtually absent on the net itself. They've started a whole very ambitious program to develop a critical discourse on new media culture in their region.

Q: Can you tell us something more about what happened on the Internet landscape following the crash of dotcom mania?

A: At the time of the dotcom boom a lot of companies tried to earn money using the World Wide Web. They started e-commerce sites, hoping that customers would go to

their websites and maybe buy something, that they would leave their credit card numbers and purchase something, or that they would visit a site and then after that go shopping. This is unfortunately what most people think these days when the Web is mentioned. Of course, it was not designed as a shopping mall. It was primarily designed with the idea of retrieving information, to be a sort of archive. As a very rich and diverse kind of world library, which was maybe more the idea of its founders, it enables the exchange of files and for different material to be brought on-line. This material can then be discussed with colleagues or a broader audience. After the dotcom crash, there has been a new wave of Internet applications and possibilities. I would like to take a look at a few of them. First of all, we can see the rise of weblogs, or blogs, a much more interactive version of the webpage or homepage, where people just have information. Unlike the homepage, a weblog lets all users send their comments, to give their input into the site. They employ easy-to-use software, so that users, those visiting the site, can immediately respond and contribute something of their own. This is a very big cultural change, whereas in the time of the dotcoms, websites would be used to push content, to push ideas. In the revolution that is happening right now, we can see much more involvement of Internet users themselves. This is also reflected in another development, in so-called peer-to-peer networks, where people exchange files. Napster is the most famous of these, but now there are many, many more. Although Napster itself was closed down, peer-to-peer networks such as Kazaa and others are incredibly popular, especially to swap mp3 files. On the other hand, people are increasingly starting to exchange texts. In my field, for instance, people are starting to exchange course outlines of University programs, thinking: 'Why shouldn't we share this information, why shouldn't we share things like this as well?' Universities say: 'Bring all the courses on-line!' So, you can basically exchange all the digital files in existance. In these cases, we shouldn't only think about Warner Bros. and Disney and the sets of restrictions that surround them. Peer-to-peer networks and file sharing is a very rich and diverse activity. It's not the copyright infringement aspect of it, maybe it's the most well-known, but by no means is it the only way. This could also mean that peer-to-peer networks will have a future beyond the question of intellectual property rights. Personally I think that sites such as Napster and Kazaa are the least interesting, for the simple reason that the level between those who participate and just take something out and those who contribute is very uneven. Unfortunately, a lot of people took information out of Napster, but contributed little to the network. I think that in the near future peer-to-peer networks will only survive if smaller versions of them bring things into balance. You take information out, but you also contribute. I think that's a more interesting phenomenon.

Since the early '90s, we've seen the rise of Free Software. During the dotcom period there was a very unfortunate sort of infighting in that community. There's been a split between those who favor Free Software, and those who favor a slightly more commercial approach called 'Open Source'. This is why we use both terms, which for outsiders are probably the same, but they have a slightly different emphasis concerning the licensing of software production. This difference is maybe a bit too much for insiders, but the principle is the same. A lot of companies actually did survive the dot.com

crash. They were simply not big enough I think, to crash. So it was very fortunate for us that the Free Software phenomenon was not so big in the late '90s. A lot of the initiatives survived after the whole hype died. The companies and individuals involved are much more open now to the ideas and principles of Free Software and Open Source. I also think that this kind of development has a great future in the current time.

Q: Do you think that Internet communities are experiencing a kind of shift in their role as an "alternative" means of struggle? Is there any indicator that the Internet in general is becoming a much wider social category?

A: It's very interesting to look at what has happened to mailing list culture and, in particular at the loss of the innocence within the community. The realization that the exchange of information is not really an innocent act, and that people are seriously disagreeing with each other. What does this mean? What does this mean in an environment that is becoming increasingly hostile? Over the last ten years we've witnessed a rise in the number of virtual communities. But most of them are based on implicit consensus within the group. Everybody was in favor of open channel source, of information exchange, where you would say this and I would say that, etc. We didn't necessarily have to agree, but there was a sort of rational discourse, and over the last few years we've seen that this whole idea has very quickly eroded, and that a lot of people have come in who simply no longer share this sort of naïve almost, scientific consensus model. We've seen the rise of much greater tension on the net, and we've also seen a lot of artists starting to use methods of information warfare, not just against big corporations, or the state, but mainly against each other. I would like to talk a little bit more about that phenomenon. Information warfare has mainly been used in the context of let's say the Zapatistas in Mexico, who are fighting against the government. That's still a very naïve idea of information warfare. An ethnic population somewhere trying to stand up, revolt against power and we contribute to their struggle by using so-called hacktivist strategies. That is still a mid-nineties romantic idea, because if we go to the Internet right now, there's information war going on day and night. But it's not about the Zapatistas, it's about the enormous amount of spam we get, everybody is completely overwhelmed by the overload of information, and if you contribute something to a list or discussion, you have to be prepared to be slaughtered. If you don't understand that, then you'll be caught, and overwhelmed by the kind of on-line hostility that rules the Internet right now. I think it simply has to do with the maturity of the medium. We are no longer just a smallish ghetto somewhere, where we can pretend that we are in a better world. The Internet is very much a reflection of society at large. Everybody is involved. And I think we should be aware of this. The Internet is no longer an alternative space. Everything you find in society, you'll find on the net as well.

In kuda.org, 21. 09. 2002.

Report from India

Interview with Raqs Media Collective (Monica Narula, Jeebesh Bagchi, Shuddhabrata Sengupta) as co-initiators of Sarai, along with Ravi Vasudevan and Ravi Sundaram at CSDS [Centre for the Study of Developing Societies], Delhi

Question: Could you tell more about Raqs Media Collective/SARAI as combination of artistic work and socio-activism?

Answer: We would hesitate to describe Sarai either as a space for artistic production, or for social activism. Perhaps it can be better understood, primarily and simply as a space for reflection and practice - on cities, on forms of media practice, on the nature and histories of communication and on the politics of knowledge and information. This reflective space encounters, critically engages with, and takes into account both the production of knowledge, meaning and affect, as well as critical social responses through. This means that people who may in other contexts be called "artists", or "theorists" or "technicians" or "creative practitioners" or "social activists" can find a way of thinking, acting and creating within Sarai which are not necessarily bound or determined by the demands of having to live up to these labels.

Q: Is this „labelling" part of more global process that is happening with merge of new communication tech and cultural production? Is it result that comes out of it the most important or process itself?

A: No, the labelling happens because we live in a social order (all over the world) that is keen to classify people and put them in boxes where they can be managed better.

We always think that processes are as important as results, and sometimes a process is important in and of itself, even if the 'outcomes' are not very clear.

Q: Why and when emerged the idea for creating "Lexicon of Digital Commons"?

A: The idea of creating a "Lexicon of/for the Digital Commons" emerged while we in the Raqs Media Collective were working on an installation project that looks at law, habitation and urban space in 2001 - This project is called "$28^{\circ}28$" N/$77^{\circ}15$" E: The Coordinates of Everyday Life". At the same time, we were also getting interested in working on creating an online platform for the sharing of cultural material, which would enable access, download and transformation of each other's production, without prejudice to the tracing of ownership, even as it respected the authorial signature. This project evolved into the Opuscommons.net website, and we are still working on these ideas, though in contexts that are pushing the original framework. We are trying to think about the possibility of an offline/online production context for digital creativ-

ity in terms similar to what was tried out in Opus, with the Cybermohalla Project at Sarai. This will be known eventually as the "Apna Opuss" or "Our Own Opuss" project.

This is by way of background information. The "Lexicon" was written by us as an exercise in the clarification of the conceptual fields that we were investigating in these projects, for ourselves. We wanted to see if it was possible to take metaphors from the realm of digital technology and apply them playfully to try and arrive at a tangential understanding of urban realities, of community, of creativity. We have found the "Lexicon" a useful map of/for our own ideas, and the terms that came up in it continue to underlie much of our work as a set of conceptual foundations.

Q: It seems that "Lexicon" addresses to high lightening connections between new technologies and society? Why is social aspect of new technologies important?

A: It is important to understand the social aspects of every kind of technology, new or old. The technology that enabled manual copying by scribes in medieval times led to a particular kind of relationship between power, ownership, control over reproduction and circulation of manuscripts and knowledge, which was both more intimate as well as more hierarchical, with a scribe becoming more or less a 'slave of the text'. That changed with the introduction of printing presses. Books became mass produced objects that no longer needed to be hoarded or chained to their shelves. Translations and multiple editions made a more democratic practice of knowledge and culture possible.

Similarly, the photocopier or the fax machine made possible a new kind of politics in the eighties in Eastern Europe and China. The personal computer and the Internet, and the ease of digital reproduction, bring new factors to bear on the relationship between power and knowledge. They create new solidarities, and new disparities that are formed because people happen to communicate in new ways. All these social aspects of new technologies bear consideration.

Ultimately, the relations between machines and people is an indirect relation between people and people. It is people who design, produce and work with machines. Technology embodies human creativity, labour, drudgery, anxiety, pleasure and pain. In a deep sense, all machines are prosthetic devices; they act as extensions, or interventions in and on the body of the human being.

Communication Technologies, and by definition, all of new media, are social. They are about sociality, about what happens when people want to talk and listen to each other. Talking and listening are political acts. If some people talk all the time, and everyone else listens, that is one kind of political set up; if no one talks, that is another kind of political arrangement; if some people 'listen in' on others, if some people talk back, if some people feel excluded from a conversation, if some people are prevented from talking, if a person has the freedom to tell someone else what they just heard – all these point to different kinds of political and social arrangements, to a deep politics of information and communication.

Each of these can be seen in new media: the size of bandwidth, the presence or absence of surveillance, the institutions of intellectual property, the presence or absence of censors. All of these are also technological questions, questions about the design of hardware and software, just as they are questions about who talks, how much, to whom, who listens, etc.

This is why, every form of communication, and every piece of hardware and software that enables communication, should be examined in political and social terms. This is not to demand a primacy of the social and the political; it is just to accept and to understand that there is no running away from the social dimensions of technology.

Q: Today critical discourse is established as mainstream form of dialogue, from highest structures in society to totally marginalized individuals. Which aspect of critique SARAI represents?

A: There are kinds and kinds of critical discourse. Some do occupy a central position within mainstream discourses. However, we do feel that there is (and must be) room for the critical attitude to open out new areas of thought, and to propel curiosity, and also to ensure that we do not take prevalent cultural and social realities to be eternal and un-transformable.

At Sarai, we are committed to modes of criticism that do not impair openness in thinking and practice. Sometimes, one is "critical" in a habitual, rather than in a reflective, sense. By the "habitual" sense we mean the automatic assumption of an adversarial position, a certain predilection for negativity, a taste for conflict for the sake of conflict. This 'critique for "critique's sake" can lead to a loss of intellectual and creative rigour.

We want to foreground productive criticality that remains alive to the asking of questions, to the pursuit of questions beyond the boundaries of the easy answer. We want to set in motion a relay between different kinds of questions.

Of course, in doing this, we want to also remain alive at all times to asking what it is about any intellectual or creative method, any form or practice of expression or configuration of space that enables free and fearless speech; about self organization of ways of doing things that is not coercive; and about protocols of conduct and communication that are inclusive. We see a habit and practice of 'productive criticalityy as conducive to this.

Productive Criticality is a positive sensibility; it is more interested in the creation and sustenance of the means to act freely in the world, than it is in the gesture of confrontation. It bases itself on the understanding that people creating and making things, asking questions and listening carefully, create the conditions of the continuous transformation of the world.

Q: Questions of market and new economy relations are transforming the society, which has positive and negative consequences. Could the flow/direction of transformations be influenced?

A: At a general level, if we think that the direction of transformations in society cannot be influenced, then we, or anyone for that matter, might as well stop thinking, reading, writing, creating or doing anything with our minds, eyes, hands and consciousness. The expression "Art (or cultural/intellectual activity) does not change the world" is a cliché, and tells us just about as much as its opposite – "Art changes the world". Artistic and intellectual activity is a part of the elements that make the world what it is. When art practice, or lines of enquiry and thought change, the world changes; when the world changes, art and intellectual activity also change, in response to a changing world.

The market, and the social relations that control the production and exchange of commodities based on a system of wage labour, are not the inventions of what is called the "new economy". The "new economy's" deepest layers go back at least to the seventeenth century, if not earlier.

For us, the important and critical question remains one of understanding the dynamics of power and control. What is it that contributes to a lack of liberty and equity? Why do abundant intellectual and creative resources have to be artificially induced to enter the straight jacket of scarcity, so as to ensure that they remain "valuable"? These are questions that artistic and intellectual investigation can enter into, and by so doing, they do challenge the monopoly of certain narratives, or explanations. It may be premature to arrive at a definitive conclusion about whether or not this scepticism towards the explanations that underwrite the control of market forces or of the state on our imaginations is changing or has changed the world. One thing is certain, we certainly look at the world very differently because of all the things that we read and see and hear. Looking at the world differently, sometimes we end up taking steps we may otherwise not have taken. One step at a time, and continuously, quietly, the world changes, just as much as it does suddenly and radically.

Q: Detection of society and new societal relations ensues from societal circumstances or is confrontation with it conscious decision? What's your experience and observation in Indian society?

A: Confrontation is occasionally a necessity. There certainly are times when situations become so intolerable that they must be refused and rejected, categorically, and explicitly. At many other times, confrontation can also be counter-productive. Too much explicitness can alert the forces that you are trying to overcome or subvert to your existence, and they can crack down very hard on you, especially if you are trying to do something critical and different. This is what the experience of living and working in a society like India today, teaches us.

In India, today, there are many possibilities open for new and innovative forms of creative activity. This is so mainly because cultural institutions (barring the commercial film industry and to a certain extent, publishing) are weak, and a great deal of the cultural space is empty, waiting in a sense to be filled with new ideas and activities. At the same time, there is a powerful presence of mechanisms of censorship and self-censorship. These mechanisms are both official and unofficial, governed by the agencies of the state, as well as by non-state actors.

The task of the cultural practitioner and the intellectual in these circumstances is to negotiate a space for the maximization of liberty, for the sharing and augmentation of knowledge and creativity, by ensuring that the "eye of the censor" is, for want of a better word, "distracted".

This may involve creating a multiplicity of small, agile, sometimes ephemeral, initiatives, rather than concentrating on big and visible events and strategies that are actually more vulnerable to control.

Q: General spots – gender, ecology, human rights. How much western models of the latter stipulate transformation of traditional India?

A: It is time that we stopped thinking of a distinction between models that are "western" and "traditional Indian". Perhaps it is time we held the term "model" itself in question. We have to ask, in each instance, what is the method or form of practice that maximizes liberty, contributes to human happiness and creativity, does the least amount of environmental damage, and is more equitable. There are aspects and elements of all traditions, histories, and cultures (eastern, western, modern, traditional) that are conducive to more equitable gender relations, ecological and more respectful of the rights of individuals and communities. The opposite of this statement is also true. An intelligent practitioner of cultural politics would be able to curate different elements together on the basis of what is relevant to the specificity of time and space, incorporating elements that are both familiar and strange so as to ensure that everything is looked at and thought about afresh.

Q: Could you tell more about networking on the local and global level: tools, potentials, possibilities, benefits of South-East Asia?

A: In Delhi, we are located in North India, which occupies a significant location within the South Asian subcontinent. People from all over the Republic of India live in Delhi, speaking a huge variety of languages, practicing and inventing many cultures and all the world's major religions. We live in a city of migrants. Migrants learn about the value of networking before they learn anything else.

We are not far from Western India, South Western China, Pakistan and Afghanistan. Central Asia, South East Europe, South East Asia and the far South and North East of India are in some senses equidistant from where we are. Besides, there are close con-

nections, through immigration and economic links, with the British Isles, Western Europe, East Africa, Tibet, Nepal, Bangladesh, Australia and North America, and for more recent historic-political reasons with much of Russia, ex-Yugoslavia and Eastern Europe. This sense of geography orients one to a feeling of being located at several overlapping crossroads, built by history, and shaped by contemporary realities. This makes the experience of living in Delhi akin to that of someone being influenced by many overlapping conversations, reading many languages, curious about a host of different realities. Many of us also share the English language with other English language speakers all over the world.

Delhi is also a densely technological space. It is marked by a dense intersection of formal as well as informal information industries of varying scale. There are large call centres, software factories, as well as small desktop publishers, legal and non-legal software vendors and many different kinds of media practitioners. Everywhere, in every neighbourhood there are telephone shops to make long distance calls, and cyber cafés for very cheap Internet connectivity.

All of this suggests a possibility of many connections: connections between different cultures and cultural practices, between different languages and ways of doing things, between intellectual, artistic, social and technical activities. What we can call an ethic and practice of "dense connectivity". What could be the key characteristics of "Dense Connectivity"?

> That it enables communications from all agents and that it is able to augment the communicative capacities of those that are "weak communicators" because of structural, logistical, social and political reasons. This means that a dense communication network, like a tropical forest, would have a great deal of diversity in its ecology.
> That a space of "dense connectivity" makes room for different rhythms, intensities and frequencies of communicative activity. That it has room for old as well as new, fast as well as slow media.
> That it has enough hubs, connectors and re-routing devices that enable communication across diversity. This means mechanisms that translate, devices that enable collaboration, and peer-to-peer networks that enable exchange and sharing, and a commons into which different actors can contribute and draw from.

This understanding is gleaned from the way things work, and do not work, in the physical and cultural space we are located in. We can apply this understanding to any idea of how a network of media initiatives and organizations can emerge or act in concert, especially in spaces outside the traditional "bases" of new media culture in Western Europe, Northern America, Australia and the Pacific Rim.

Q: India is well known for export of software experts. Brain drain? What's your opinion as someone who is living in India and compare it to most common view on India from western point of view?

A: Software exports do not by any stretch of imagination represent "Brain Drain". The image of India as a net software exporter is greatly exaggerated. There are many "outsourcing" operations, particularly in North America, that use Indian operations for what is called "Bug Fixing" and a series of assembly line software processes. This is not a very large phenomenon, although it is growing, and it attracts considerable attention, along with other branches of the Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) industry, which includes transcription, secretarial services, ticketing, call centre work and other operations.

Additionally, "bodyshoppers" operating on behalf of multinational software corporations hire Indian programmers for short term and contractual work, and sometimes relocate them to the United States, especially to California for periods when there is intense demand for highly skilled labour in the software industry.

The so-called "Brain Drain" actually refers to the emigration of trained technicians, scientists and intellectuals from India to other countries, mainly the US and the UK, and to a lesser extent, Australia. "Brain Drain" was never a phenomenon that was in anyway detrimental to the interests of capital and industry in India, or to institutions of higher academic learning and research. Technicians and intellectuals who studied in India and went for "higher" training overseas and worked in international institutions and organizations kept contact with their colleagues and peers in India. If anything, Indian institutions and enterprises benefited from this contact. To think in terms like Brain Drain in India is in a strange way to mirror the anxieties about the racist and xenophobic paranoia in the West about Indians and Chinese taking over the world with their devious and cunning brains.

Incidentally, the greatest number of people who emigrate from India, to the Gulf countries, to Western Europe and North America are people who work in factories, workshops, hospitals (as nurses), small shops, informal trade, restaurants and as agricultural labour – what would this be called, perhaps – "Brawn Drain"? No one ever seems to worry about "Brawn Drain". In fact, quite the opposite.

Q: What is the status of The Free Software Movement in India, in both creative and social sense?

A: There is quite a strong Free Software Movement in India at the moment. Much of it is based amongst computer science students and programmers, but there is also beginning to be a 'lay' appreciation of the culture of free software. Frederick Noronha, a Free Software activist based in Goa, is already writing a 'history' of the free, libre and open source software (FLOSS) movement in India (so there must be something to write a 'history' about!).

There are GNU/Linux users groups in all major cities and many small towns, and an active movement for the 'localization' of GNU/Linux in many Indian languages, especially Bengali, Tamil, Kannada and Hindi.

There is also beginning to be an appreciation of the communitarian and social character of FLOSS. People within NGOs, social movements and some others who consider themselves part of the 'democratic' left are beginning to express an interest in the 'political economy' of FLOSS, although this interest is not by any means of a uniform character. Various state governments and government departments in India are also interested in FLOSS. And there is an occasionally lively debate in the popular press about the merits and demerits of Free Software. None of this was really present in any significant way even five years ago, so this is really something that has happened quite recently.

However, the interest in Free Software tends to have a utilitarian, functional edge - often people take to it because it is cheap to use, allows one to customize and adapt, and is robust. It hasn't yet attracted all the creative energy it could have, but our sense is that this will change, and once localization efforts are finally translated into easily available software resources with sufficient support in Indian languages, the whole free software usage scenario will undergo a rapid and radical expansion. We think this is not very far away, and then there might be a real explosion in creative ways of working with Free Software in India.

Economy, Policy and Cultural Production in a Global Digital Age

Interview with Saskia Sassen, Chicago

Question: I would like to ask you something about globalization and different cultural production aspects. One of the subjects we are interested in is the growth of copyright laws and different intellectual property infringements all over the world. Can you try to paint some broader picture about what's happening in that field, in terms of globalization?

Answer: It's being taken to an absolute extreme, and it's something that has been in the system for a very long time. But it crosses a threshold in terms of making proprietary entities out of famous cases like plantseeds, and including information that may come from your own genetic code, making that proprietary. It takes it to an extreme that we have not seen historically, and in that sense it is a different move from the past where you had a lot of the protection of private property and the privatizing of many elements. Frankly, I don't think it's sustainable. I think they've taken it too far. But there will be many parts of it, already implemented, that are in one way or another sustainable. There is one other element that raises this enormous inequality that we're seeing, this total disenfranchising. And in the long run, I think it will hit back - creating a boomerang effect. And then, there is the French Revolution, Maria Antoinette said: 'Let them have cake.' Well, she lost her head. I don't think that history can accommodate these extremes of our appropriation. In the mean time they'll have a ball, there will be a lot of suffering, lots of farmers will become poorer than they have ever been. So, it is devastating. It is a total abuse of the concept of private property, but I think it's so extreme that it's not sustainable, look at what's happening with CDs and downloading from the Internet. The controls are not working, because in this case there are capabilities built into technologies that will undermine that model of proprietary knowledge, goods, etc. I have this sense that it will do a lot of damage, but it's unsustainable. That doesn't mean that we'll get a pretty picture after that, but this, what we're seeing now, the way they want to execute the project of private property, intellectual property is just a way out. It's very extreme and in that sense it's a new thing.

Q: I'm interested in the question of the European Union as a new soft empire - an empire of the future which is growing. Things are very interesting right now, in May this year, ten Central European countries are entering the EU, and this series of copyright and intellectual property laws can be seen as a part of the standardization process. During your lecture you mentioned that this notion of the national wants to disappear. How are the different standards of this growing empire going to influence cultural production?

A: There are two or three things I want to stress. One is that I did also talk about how the national state using national institutions does part of the work of implementing these new international standards, rules, and norms. It's not that national states cannot do any of the work in constructing the global regime. One of the things we've already seen with finance in a lot of the Central European countries, is that national states, in Czech Republic and in Poland, they did the work through the legislative, judicial, and executive arms, and thus implemented the rules. The fact that you have an international regime does not mean that the national state can't be doing the work of implementing the international regime. I mean, it can. I have two more things I would like to say about this. I think that enlargement is an interesting proposition. One angle on the issue is that it's such a big challenge for the European Union and it's going to be dealing with countries that are really quite different. They don't have that, to some extent, shared history that the Western European countries have had. So, it will force the issue. They will either succeed or fail. If they succeed they will have learned, they will have acquired the capability to handle the work done by many elements, including civil society, cultural work, etc. In the work that it will take to really successfully execute enlargement, the European Union will have learned how to negotiate enormous diversity, through the mediation of laws and norms, treaties, and institutions rather then the bombs and guns the United States likes to use to mediate these situations. In other words, going into the difficult work of enlargement, it will have succeeded in strengthening soft imperial capability. To me, that is why the factor of enlargement signals to me that this is an empire that is growing. This is a form of empire, a 'soft empire', and I wouldn't be surprised if this faze of enlargement works, that there will be a next faze, and that it will be bigger then we anticipate. I don't know if it will be more or less successful, but the point I'm trying to make is that the difficulty itself forces the European Union to actually learn how to do this, and to learn how to do this with increasing diversity, because the Central and Eastern European countries are more different than say, France to Germany, Germany to the Netherlands etc.

Q: Does power learn from its mistakes? You've mentioned the '60s and the large amount of liberal ideas (not 'neo-liberal'), and how power structures hijacked all these ideas about individuality and flexibility in order to use the dream of this 'baby boom' generation? They want to be individual, and they want to do what they want to do, instead of their parents who want them to work in a factory from 9 to 5? How does this happen?

A: Well, I am not so sure that power learns from its mistakes. But, power learns from the difficulties it has to solve to execute its projects. That much I'm persuaded of. And does it learn from its mistakes? I have a very hard time believing that. I don't think it does, because otherwise empires would last longer than they do. I mean they just don't. When you see cases like Afghanistan, they thought that they had solved the long history of the impossibility of external control of Afghanistan. Now they know that in fact, you can't have control of Afghanistan. And I don't think that power learns from its mistakes. But when power has a project, it will learn from its difficulties. The dis-

tortion of the United States is that it comes with these huge bombs and for a while, there is the military entertainment complex and war as simulation. Does it learn from its mess? I don't know.

You were asking me about the '60s and I must tell you that I'm at a slight disadvantage here. I have an enormous amount of difficulty seeing this picture of the individual. I'm not at all psychological and I have a very hard time understanding it. I see the structural stuff and what we did – dynamics, friction and learning how to deal with friction. I see the politics and powerlessness. Individuals, and these crazy forms of individuality that you see in the United States, they're slightly hermetic. My husband always says, 'I may have a spiritual life, but I don't have a psychological life!' I saw something in your question that is more systemic, in a sense that this is an ironic distortion of something that in the '60s was embedded in the enabling of norms, norms that enable those who've been excluded and disadvantaged. It is a project to create more equality. You can see it in much legislation, poverty, the Immigration Act of 1964, which eliminates racial quotas, etc. And then this is carried to another threshold. It's the same thing with private property. We've had that for a long time, what we're doing with intellectual property rights today is taking it to another threshold, where it then becomes a transformed condition.

Q: Are you going to be an official part of the World Summit on the Information Society taking place in Geneva? Are you participating?

A: Well, I'm doing both. I am accredited, and we have a conference actually where I chair a committee. The conference is a part of the Forum on civil society actors and activists. All kinds of people who you know are going to be part of it. At the conference that we've organized, about sixty people and a lot of activists from all over the world will join in: from South America, Asia, and South Africa. So, we're doing that within the formal conference. But then on the ninth, in the evening I'm doing a thing on the outside, Florian Schneider is organizing it. I don't know how strong the counter meeting is going to be, I have a sense that it's a bit diluted. Or do you have a sense that it's strong?

Q: I'm not sure really. I'm on that preparatory mailing list, and people are trying to organize an event, but without real focus. That's my opinion. That's the real advantage of the official Summit because they are very structured and very organized.

A: But sometimes it manages to do it very well. For example, the counter women's meetings in Beijing and Nairobi were amazing. But now I have the impression that this counter event is not going to work very well.

Q: Counter meetings' statements are very clear, at least on paper. They are much more critical towards some of the noble ideas the official Summit has, like overcoming the digital divide.

A: I agree completely, but I think it's not going to be a people's event. Because what you want is people who have not thought about these issues, people who still, even if they are leftist, think that the digital divide is the issue. And it should be more like teachings that they learn. It should be used for that, and that is what I think is not going to happen very much at the counter.

Q: What do you think should be the visible result of the official Summit? It's a long-term project, the next one is going to happen in 2005 in Tunisia. I'm just wondering about this megalomanic plan for building an information society. What is going to happen with that idea?

A: These meetings are epiphenomenal interventions. The constructing of an information economy with all relevant elements is not what has been happening at these meetings. This is a way of producing a narrative for public consumption, and then it all looks like there are so many good people involved with good intentions, so it can circulate as a pretty narration of the thing. And that is why the counter activities would have been so important. A lot of activists who use the Internet, they don't have tools to develop a critical analysis of what's happening. So the counter meeting should have been the teaching that indicates to people: 'We're going to explain to you how we are going to do critical analysis that goes beyond the digital divide.' And that I don't think has happened, and I do think that the meetings are epiphenomenal - they're exposed. But also, the program of the official Summit has a lot of very worthy people in it. They have opened it up to all kinds of interesting and even critical leftwing groups. But, the whole event's structure is based on after-effect, because the order has been constructed basically. So, it looks like the Summit in Geneva and different United Nation's events won't change the world information order. Do you agree with that or not?

Q: Definitely. With the official Summit, they're just a broader market. They've forced undeveloped countries to buy technology and infrastructure.

A: It's terrible. I just wrote a paper on how electronic activists from the global south have been innovative with technology. It's not just a question of getting all the fancy software and the computers sent by Microsoft.

Q: In one of your essays, you were talking about this idea of mobility and hyper-mobility. Is this in terms of the information industry, or ICT infrastructure, or something else?

A: I think I talked about mobility and fixity, and the notion that we had a sort of refined mobility, and then it moves into hyper-mobility with new technology and digitalizing different sectors of society. That creates a massive distortion and disablement. We just focused on that outcome, rather then hyper-mobility, financial instruments that can circulate around the world in a second. That's impressive. But then we neglect things by just looking at mobility, hyper-mobility, the technologies and what they can do, it's the world of materialness that it takes to get that outcome. I want to recover the other

part of the loop, which has turned out to be a much longer loop, and that what we call hyper-mobility is just one element. There are consequences to leaving out the rest of the loop, which means that in order to have this moment of complex process that you call hyper-mobility, it takes a sense of place, it takes building environments, it takes not only professional workers, but also low-wage workers. I want to recover these things and thereby enable actors and the notion of place that are made invisible, or they are sort of evicted from the account if you just look at hyper-mobility. So, for me it's a way of saying that low-wage immigrant workers who may never have used a computer are still part of the infrastructure that it takes in order to have hyper-mobility, and I want those immigrant workers to know that too. I always do this in all sorts of finance, I've mapped finance in Manhattan, which is mostly global finance in terms of all the workers that it needs, including the truckers that bring the software, the toilet paper, the light bulbs, and whatever, and where they live. So then I said: 'OK, this is New York City's global financial sector. Yes, it has Wall Street, and it has global circuits, but you know what? It also has these immigrant neighborhoods – these neighborhoods of white working class women who are clerical workers, the truckers. It needs this industrial zone to do a lot of the servicing – the industrial servicing.' I do the same thing with hyper-mobility. And then I talk about these imbrications, in other words. What is mobile and what is immobile, and it's not that they are hybrids, they are very distinct moments. I use the term imbrications to be suggestive, that they need each other to build upon each other. And added fixity, capital fixity will add hyper-mobility, so there is dynamism. It's not binary.

Q: It's not an opposite, it's like different aspects.

A: Exactly. Nor is this, in this case hybridism, it's not that there is a blur. The digital is definitely different from the walls of the building, and I don't want to inject hybridism into that representation. So, that is more of the idea for me. It's both reality that is distorted by just being enamored with hyper-mobility, and it is an account representation that evicts all those other actors. So you have the information 'haves' and information 'have nots', which is also a distortion. Frankly, a lot of the NGOs in the global south are way ahead of the global north NGOs in terms of using those technologies, because they've needed it, because the telephone wasn't in operation, and the fax was too expensive, so they were way ahead. And it seems to me that the global north has the hardest time understanding that. Out of the limited resources in the global south, these NGOs have developed capabilities so that they are not just consumers. They have invented new ways of intervening in the technology that makes it work for them, because they have low bandwidth and slow connectivity. And out of that disadvantage, they have developed capabilities. They have created technological innovations in the software, and the global north is very often a passive consumer. So it's not just disadvantage in information; it's just a messier map in a way.

Q: Is India a typical example? They have a lot of people developing Open Source and Free Software.

A: They have incredibly interesting applications of Open Source. There are a lot of people who have really learned, acquired capabilities in handling difficult situations. To be disadvantaged is not absolute and finite.

In Belgrade, 07. 12. 2003.

Transcription of the interview is not authorized.

Report from Africa

Interview with Marcus Neustetter, Johannesburg

Question: Who are organizations and individuals who are now perspectively working in new media art fields in Africa?

Answer: When addressing the topic of new media or digital art in Africa one cannot ignore the nature of the context and its developing communities. The focus on survival needs and strategies are essential influencing factors in the production and the development of the skills. These aspects often overpower the need for playful creative experiments that start to explore the possibilities of technologies for creative practice. This has focused the development of new media art to mainly evolve from the artists that are interested in exploring the relationship of their ideas and new technologies. With limited resources and understanding the development has mainly accepted video art into the artistic practice. However, there are practitioners that are inspired by the possibilities of experimenting with other technology as a medium and pursuing the platform and audience via the Internet. New Media or more appropriately digital art in Africa is slowly developing through the traditional art practitioners experimenting with technologies such as digital cameras (video and still), computers and digital sound. These practitioners have also evolved out of the design and digital/ online advertising fields and are applying their skills to producing creative experiments.

As these trends are emerging, even though limited in scope, and very disparate, platforms are emerging to host outcomes. Even though under-supported and not recognized as all too valuable within the larger need for development, selected galleries, collections and art competitions are gearing themselves up to limited screen based work, such as video, and sound, as these are technically relatively easy and cost effective for both organisers and audiences. This however can only be mapped onto very few countries and their institutions. In the training and development field however a much greater reach is occurring with organisations and media centres aiming to educate communities and artists to use technology. These skills are very often focused on the development of skills using computers for online research, website construction, image manipulation and email communication.

A key concern in the development of these singular institutions and organisations is the lack of communication and exchange between the activities. If one looks at the context of South Africa as an example, which is probably the most developed in the field of digital or new media arts on the sub-Saharan continent, these are institutions that are stimulating digital activity such as the University of the Witwatersrand (Johannesburg) running a Masters course in Digital Media, University of Johannesburg with their own multi media course, and Cape Town University with a Film and multimedia programme. Here resources and knowledge could be shared more effectively in

growing a network and an information exchange base. Even though these institutions are working in the field of digital activity, the digital communication tools and strategies are not yet applied to use them effectively for creating an inclusive network and communication.

An organisation such as Africancolours.com is however differently focused. Based in Zimbabwe and operating online, their main aim is to create an information and communication exchange through the net for artists from the region. Making use of the internet café for training and partnerships with other projects, Africancolours.com has built a information hub that uses the medium to profile creative activities on the continent. While the profile is not specifically digital or new media art this is an effective method of introducing the platform, the technology and the challenges to the artistic community.

Similarly, the Triangle Arts Network, which has an extensive residency network around the world, is currently engaging on more effective use of the net for their communication exchange. Within Africa specifically there has been extensive training of artists in the skills of web development, which allows for a growing skills base that not only contributes to their online presence as a network and informs us about the artists, the workshops, exhibitions and outcomes, but creates e-mail literate community that understands the value of information exchange.

In attempting to network organisations such as these on the continent in order to create a stronger foundation for sharing and development, strategies need to be applied, which are sensitive to the complexities of the political climate, the concerns with poverty and health, literacy and access, and basic survival. Currently the UNESCO Digi-Arts Africa programme is attempting to develop such strategies that aim to build a network with the local communities can take ownership of. Through research on the creative industries it has become clear that there is a lack of communication within the region, which could be as a result of informal networks not yet having been addressed effectively. Imposed top-down structures for communication and exchange are not creating buy-in and allowing communities to take ownership and make use of them.

Q: How communication process is realizing itself with language barrier existing as Anglophone and Francophone Africa?

A: The communication on the continent is made more difficult through the Anglo and Francophone divides. Communication and information systems such as websites are rarely bilingual and are set up to service a specific community and region. This enforces barriers and makes it more difficult for interested and active individuals and organisations to learn from their neighbours, respond theoretically or be able to apply strategies for a more unified voice, as well as production and theoretical approach. Another influencing factor are the African vernacular languages that often map very different networks and interactions to the individuated nation states. A language bar-

rier is also evident in the divide between the urban and rural communities that are also embodied by contemporary and traditional approaches. Part of this divide is also predicated on the change of the urban environment becoming more "global" in its development, bringing with it new language barriers of new technology with new knowledge systems and languages that need to be learnt to be able to engage with the contemporary world.

Q: What is the status with realizing support, reliable funding for independent initiatives and how are they dealing with financial problems?

A: Not only are cultural funding sources limited, but there are rarely categories in funding applications and systems that allow for new media or technological submissions. While there is much ICT (Information and Communication Technology) support and development, the links with the cultural sector have not yet been successfully created. Developing sustainable programmes by International supporters and funding bodies have been difficult and largely unsuccessful which has left a large "give-me" society of artists that have been receiving support in skills, technology and even funding and are left to their own devices when the supporting funds come to an end. As the relationship of the culture and technology is so new in this context, creating programmes that do not seem imposed but necessary for the local development has been difficult. Education around the value of engaging creatively with technology and creating buy-in with practitioners, audiences and developers, is a challenging process when much expectation and hype is created around the technology. For example many African artistss sites have been developed to profile the artists in order to introduce the internet and technology opportunities to the local arts communities. While this is not digital art as such, it is used as a first step to address the relationship between traditional art practice and a contemporary medium. This has created high expectations within artistic communities to now suddenly be able to sell their work online or be discovered by international curators. A false illusion of the net, that in other industries caused a whole dotcom crash. For many local producers this becomes a disappointing introduction to the relationship of art and technology.

While IT and education are being recognized as a valuable connection by some of the local governments, the connection between the cultural sector and new technologies is still far down on the list of priorities. This should however encourage practitioners and organisations to develop approaches to tackle the existing connections to IT from other sectors and develop relationships with them. So for example the arts education can be further developed through the relationship with new technologies, therefore introducing and encouraging a link between the cultural and IT sectors.

Q: Is there critical approach in media art and new technologies in Africa?

A: The understanding and theoretical debate of new media art is hardly present in academic institutions, artistic communities or audiences. While a debate on the digital divide is ongoing, little effort is being made to extend this to cultural interventions

through digital media, using the virtual platforms and media. The lack of infrastruc-ture does impact heavily on effective communication and exchange within the region and reflection and interaction with the international network.

Critique is quickly launched at proposed or existing digital projects when the medium does not engage with the context and the understanding of the audience. While this is probably the case for most digital art audiences and critique, a particular sensitivi-ty obviously needs to be considered in an environment where literacy, knowledge and exposure to such activity are limited.

Q: In raising "Information Society", Africa seems to be an embodiment for what is considered as digital divide...

The digital divide is blatantly clear in every day interaction with local communities. The know-how and the resources are by far not common. More regularly I am howev-er pleasantly surprised how people are connecting themselves in alternative ways in order to be part of the information and communication hub. Second-hand email use amongst friends, families and even business colleagues is one way those with less resource are able to communicate with the rest of the world. Sharing phones with sep-arate sim-cards has also allowed for underprivileged individuals to be able to check their messages, send a free sms and receive free calls, keeping them connected, reachable and part of a digital society.

What must be acknowledged is that in combating the notions of the digital divide, a different approach has started to emerge. To overcome the divide, context specific needs are slowly being addressed in order to make the technology relevant and find-ing locally relevant alternative uses of the technology that is inserted into a communi-ty to connect it or that might already be present. Radio, television and mobile phone engagement by artists is limited even though these are the platforms with the most viewers.

While the medium of the radio is under-utilised by the arts, within South Africa there are a large number of community radio initiatives as well as university campus radio stations that are attempting to broadcast focused relevant content to their localized audience. The main content of the community stations is educational, as government and private sector are using these stations as tools for creating awareness such as around HIV/AIDS. Many stations, such as Alex FM, cater for specifically focused tar-get groups, in the lowest income bracket, educating a locally based community through grants and some advertising to cover basic costs. This medium has proven itself valuable as an effective tool for education, promoting local education, but often at the cost of art and alternative creative content.

Digital divide issues are being addressed by the objective of international summits, meetings and festivals is the development of the "information society" it is essential for the local community to buy into the uses of this society. Unfortunately there is the dif-

ficult task to make this society relevant on a local level, which is a challenge that addresses local outcomes and opportunities to try develop a self-sustainable contribution to the global debates with local outcomes and changes. An anecdote of fishermen using a local internet café in order to get the weather forecast before they go our to sea illustrates that the information needs to be introduced to the communities to allow it to enhance their lives. Then they can use it, take ownership and eventually contribute.

Q: Are legal bodies aware about potential of IT (Information Technologies) in society development?

A: While the IT industry is set with financial and business objectives and strategies, it too needs to be introduced to the alternative methodologies and approaches to consider their context and communities. The developmental focus of the IT industry is rarely geared towards the creative engagement of their technologies. Since there is most social development that needs to take place on grassroots level dealing with issues of poverty, health, safety, the effect of political instability, war, etc. the incorporation of IT is limited in the approach of cultural development.

Q: On what level is existing infrastructure in different countries in South Africa (Zimbabwe, Botswana...)?

A: It needs to be understood that creative digital products are mainly coming from the urban hubs on the African continent where resources and skills are more accessible, even though still scarce in comparison to first world contexts.

In the southern African region, South Africa is clearly the context with the most resources and is therefore most active in the field. In the francophone region in West Africa, Dakar has been developing extremely quickly. As Internet cafés are emerging in more remote places and institutions are getting more computer oriented, so too are the possibilities for using these infrastructures for art production etc. The infrastructure alone is however not sufficient for the production and exposure of new media/ digital art. Education is required not only in skills, but in locally relevant application of ideas and concepts in terms of the resources and tools available.

In the educational and training process around art there is variation from one country to the next, where some countries have no art training at all. It is however evident that most of the creative training is from the perspective of the western notions of art rather than finding local strategies and local resource use and development. Often the notions of art and craft are also conflated, breaking down the imposed position of the artist-producer. The same complexities and models apply when looking at the infrastructure and education of new media. Local buy-in and development is made difficult by the complex notions of digital art and high-end technology that illustrates some of the international examples and practices if it is addressed at all.

Art Analysis of Global Capitalism

Interview with group Bureau d'Etudes, Paris

Question: A description of your work states that you, in a way, are continuing a kind of artistic practice and tradition that was very popular in the 1970s, a practice dedicated to mapping financial structures on a national level.

Answer: There was some research in the seventies about the structure of capitalism, kinds of organigrams, presenting connections between different company owners. In the late seventies this kind of research began to disappear. In the meantime, we read a lot of studies about capitalism and capitalist structures and thought it very interesting to try and continue this movement. But it is important for our work to have different points of view, that it doesn't just deal with the size of companies, but with religious and power-related aspects which determine their position in society and their different social activities. There are financial organizations, but these also have their institutional, judicial, religious, cultural and secret aspects. We are trying to take a different approach, not just specializing in economic or public organization. We think that connections exist between all these different groups of power. For example, if you know that some manager is radical Catholic, or if some company gives a lot of money to Catholic institutions or Catholic schools, it's clear that connections between all these different social groups exist and that they determine the structure of contemporary capitalism.

Q: In the framework of your artistic background, could you tell us more about the current position of the artist how do you view the shift of artistic work towards social engagement, with the artist having greater responsibility?

A: Our personal work hasn't changed much in that sense. Before maps we developed a project dealing with Freeness, about the relationship between the artist and the unemployed. We opened a space called the "FreeZone" in Paris, and then one in Strasbourg. It was more like the space of an experiment, a place open to the public, where people could come and take things and leave their own. It wasn't like we were creating a project, more like we were conducting an experiment. It wasn't just artistic in orientation, some people were thinking in more social terms. The project was on the borderline between an artistic situation and a social one. Because we got a lot of coverage in the mainstream press, a lot of different people visited the "FreeZone", just to see what was going on. There were also people in real need. A lot of what we talked about concerned the value of products, not just of artistic products.

However, we think that this dividing of art and social issues or politics is a social convention. It's a game and not some transcendental truth. You can use different tactics and strategies in this kind of category, but in some other category you can't. You can

use the art world as one kind of convention, but politics is another. Activities can have different domains, it's not a great problem. It's just a question of social categories.

Also, with the pacification of art, artists today are more 'rational' or 'professional' than before. It is very important to have a precise idea of activities related to art which are not part of the art system, this is not so easy. However, at the same time, if you are not in the art system, you are not an artist. We have to break this system or to exploit its resources to raise money to produce things and shift them in creative directions. This creativity is behind art and politics and that is very clear. It is between autonomy of subjectivity and political autonomy. Also, it is a question of ethics, because when youure an artist you have no money and you want to be famous. It is a way of normalization. Also, there is now the notion of collaborative work, maybe more than ever before. Before, you had institutionalized repression of collaborative practice in France, especially in schools where people working in a group had to be alone for the evaluation, you had to do it by yourself.

There is a fusion between institutions and the art market, it's a very old question. The present situation is not like that. The present situation is that you are in the art system. We think a lot about institutional criticism and we've come to the conclusion that today it is by no means efficient to have institutional criticism, it's an old question, maybe from the seventies or eighties. Then it was important to have this institutional criticism, but now it's different, we have to be more direct. We think a lot about that with our cartography: for example, a museum is just one small piece in the big capitalist system and it's impossible to just stay in the museum. It makes no sense.

Q: What is your opinion about official events like WSIS (World Summit on the Information Society)? Is it really going to change or even improve certain aspects of the information society?

A: The official summit is a private thing. It's a machine of legitimation. You have a kind of big politics, new ways of control and surveillance, new ways of industrialization of data and so on. And the summit was organized to advertise new ways of doing politics. There are some studies about the Internet, for example: the Internet enables kinds of international autonomous organization, it's not a problem for states. The utopia of this kind of network is now gone. It's over. Now it's a very efficient tool to control populations, these studies refer to Saudi Arabia, China, and Indonesia. They use the Internet as a way to control their populations.

Q: You also have examined different systems that can be looked at as control systems: ECHELON, GPS, SWIFT, satellite technology. Is the information society slowly becoming a society of control? Are we using just one small part of the possibilities of technology, the part that we are allowed to?

A: It's very clear: the information society IS a society of control. Because you can use data about everything, about bodies and people, and not just about them, but about

objects and so on. For example, it is a question of IP that holds objects and holds people and they can communicate completely spontaneously, automatized. You have a large degree of control and micro control in the body and in the infrastructure and there is an interaction between those two levels.

For example, the 'Echelon' control system is just a symptom of a system. A society of control doesn't set out to control everybody like in Stalinist countries. The contemporary method of control is not like this. It is a scientific method of control. Statistically, you are aware of different populations and you know which ones are deviant. It could also be a question of how the population can be more productive. This is a very precise sociological view of the society. There is a tendency for example, to keep deviant groups away from the rest of population. The borderline between the deviant and the 'common' people is very thin. In France recently there were lots of protests in subways against advertising. The people who organized these protests, so-called deviants, sprayed graffiti over advertisements. The other people in the subway saw this and then there was a lot of discussion between these two groups of people (those doing the graffiti and those riding the subway). The result of this discussion was that both groups were against the system of public advertising. So, there is a risk of the deviant position contaminating others. Four such protests were staged, and in the end, the police were very brutal in their reaction. The intensity of the police reaction was not proportional to the effect of the protests. This is usually what happens with street demonstrations: the police take your identity details and these details are entered into a data bank. These data banks contain all kinds of facts, when, where, and whether you've participated in different political activities. And if they want to, they can take certain facts and manipulate them. It's classic political control. But the problem is interconnection between different levels of life, because if you have a data bank about political activities and you connect it with an insurance data bank, a medical data bank and so on, you can produce a 'profile'. This profile can be observed from a biological standpoint and might reveal different things, like blood types of the profiled, and in this way you can define a different kind of population.

Q: I found some comments on your maps saying that they are too 'static' for the dynamic processes and structures they present. On your website you have something called "animated map".

A: This was more an attempt to make something more like a snippet because it's very short, it's about September 11. It's a deconstruction of one part of the map. Maps are usually completed with lots of information, and this is more like a snippet that gives you a more simpler view. For us, it is just one part of one map: you have a map full of information and it's just one way of reading the map. It's a different medium of reading information to on a map; it's a more dynamic medium and more adapted for the web. Because our maps have to be printed on paper, they are on the web to give people the opportunity to print them, reading them on the screen is not particularly easy.

Q: Do you publish your maps under some kind of license: copyright, creative commons, copyleft? What is your opinion on the latest copyright laws and infringements?

A: We have no copyright but if they're being used for commercial use, like in a magazine full of advertising, yes, we will then ask for money. Usually the maps are distributed for free but it's clear to us that we are living in a capitalist society, we're familiar with the situation.

Q: The situation in France and the EU with copyright law?

A: In France you have some old laws concerning copyright, but via annexes these old laws have been transformed into American copyright law. It's just an annex, it's not in the central law – but it's the same thing.

In kuda.org, 20. 12. 2003.

Art Production and Capitalist Oriented Market

"Let's not try to improve a sequence in the film,
but let's start with the projection of another film!"

Interview with Marina Grzinic, Ljubljana

Question: How the art market actually is structured in global capitalism? Can you explain these connections that are giving marks to the contemporary art market?

Answer: I'm not talking about the global art market, but rather about the structure of the institution of art. In the text, that was already written one year ago, part of the analysis is how the institution of modern art is functioning today, especially because its opened itself toward Second and Third World countries. I am interested in a critique, but I am much more interested to see a structure behind it and to try to make visible a system behind it. I am not interested just in criticizing, but in the ways how this system is functioning. It is a kind of affiliation, working through several elements behind the work of art in the first capitalist world, in order to be accepted as the most natural thing in the world. It's important to know that behind this naturality stands a whole system of (theoretical, critical) investments and (not only and solely) money. Money is of crucial importance in the art market, but also other investments (theoretical, critical) that in such cases stand for the whole of culture and the way it is perceived. There is a difference, a shift so to say, from culture as a common heritage toward investments into one single artwork. This process is going on practically from the first moment of the formation of the institution of modern art and the art market. This is one moment and the other one is what and how this relates to Second and Third Worlds. Here at work is another mechanism.

The so-called new global exhibition projects that include selected Third and Second World artists and their works, or which are organized just for them, are developing a different system. These projects are evidence to some important new directions, which can be seen not only as a conceptual, but primarily as a technological shift. What is important is not the work of art, but the technique of a transfer that provides the means of reproduction. In the case of an artwork that originates from outside the first capitalist world, neither its own authenticity, nor its own auto-generative capacity is valuable. It is solely here to prove the transfer of the work of art to another context and also, if it persists through time and its viability to survive in the new context. For these global exhibitions what is important is to re-use art works from the Third or Second Worlds in the process of the compression of genealogical time, to offer in such a way an evacuated, sanitized pure context that will thus be constantly perpetuated.

Or to put this even more precisely, we see a process of the cannibalisation or rapid assimilation of history and specific art practices. These exhibitions instantiated a new

form of genealogy, one that eliminates "conventional genealogical time, order, and verticality." What we have here is an over-rapid historicization and the totality set on effaces the traces of its own (im)possibility.

So my work consists of analysing and naming these processes: cannibalization, over-rapid historicization, evacuation, etc. The process of naming them is an important moment within any serious analysis. My theoretical work insists also on the point of going back and rethinking the position of science in this process. Today, science and new technology are having important roles, so it's not possible only to talk about the copy, as a process of subversion of the art institution as it was in the 1980s, but it is necessary to turn to much more artificial processes such as cloning and artificial branding.

Again, my research and my way of making the analysis is actually to show that what seems to be out of the art and cultural field (biotechnology, cloning and viability) is today co-substantial for its formation.

I propose to change the whole perspective of the relations between art, artwork, artists, cultural paradigm, cultural value, and template. This really brings us to another definition of space. All these specific spaces of the Second and Third Worlds are not simple copied, but are today re-processed under parameters of cloning and enterprised-up genealogy.

Q: You were talking about the cultural production and capitalist oriented art market. Can you tell us more about intellectual property in this context?

A: Also, it's very interesting why "cloning" might be used instead of "copy," and why biotechnology is important. I think, because they are leading us back to the idea that the place of production in art today is a laboratory. A lot of things today concerning genetic, artificial life and all those interventions in the body are done in laboratories.

What I am trying to develop here is an intensification of the politics of reproduction within a global cultural context that results in an enterprising of genealogy and processes similar to cloning. This specific type of cloning, which is firmly tied to technology, enables capital to remove the substance from the artwork. This has implications for the whole idea of enterprise. A process of expropriation that bases difference on a very different bonding, influence, and constellations; the Third and Second Worlds' difference(s) are seen solely through relations of enterprise and propriety. The exhibtions are owned and the works are branded! Donna Haraway in her book from 1997 *Modest Witness @ Second Millennium: Female Man© meets OncoMouse™* describes the effect of cloning precisely as the construction of a new kinship. She describes kinship as "a question of taxonomy, category and the natural status of artificial entities." And what are the art works from Third and Second Worlds than artificial entities, half cloned and in the process of forced naturalization within the only "natural and civi-

lized" capitalist First World? What is important to understand is the logic of the process.

The parent company is in our case the well-administrated global exhibition project that connects brands and trademarks. Making a reference to Haraway, I can say that all of these Third and Second Worlds' art works represent different kinds of substantial connection(s), kinship and genealogy, which are established solely through trademark(s) or brand(s) as its mark(s). Such exhibitions can therefore be seen as projects that mark a different set of relations, which are generated today and procreated within the deadly influence of corporate techno-science, which radically determinates, forms and articulates what is considered global culture.

I can argue that all these exhibitions have several fathers (and not one single mother, just as with the sheep Dolly) or owners who establish the brands. A specific marking now occurs through branding, which establishes a new proprietary relation. And this relation can be seen as the protection of capitalist property rights, which increasingly leads to the privatised ownership of different public projects, exhibitions and etc. All these ownership(s) – new paternal figures – are obscured by quasi impersonal rules and neutral principles in public, and heavy criticism in private, that expose how these new fathers who are behaving as dictators, imposing the absolute right of decisions. Most exhibitions are named after the father-curator!

It is also important to state that today all of these processes, especially these new proprietary relations are going in the direction of separation of creativity from resistance. This is why it's really very important to put together again creativity with processes that are questioning, or that are critical towards the system of art and the institution of art. These two processes (creativity and resistance) are practically pulled apart today by the capitalist machine, because exhibitions are facing new proprietary relations and artists are actually becoming brands and trademarks. It's like McDonald's. What I am arguing here has nothing to do with sociology. On the contrary, it's actually the way of rethinking and rearticulating the whole territory of art and culture, and questioning not only what is art, but even more, how is possible today to act in the field of art.

Q: But, art institution and art subjects are changing. Is there something going on in this field with the introduction of Internet and new communication strategies?

A: I think that the things are changing. Like, for example, the question of space. The question of space is really radically changing. Today, space is everything. If you think about the territory, you can't think just about geography. Space is today also the space of theory, because theory is pure industry in the First Capitalist World. What I want to say is, that we have to identify these differences and to include them within capitalist machine. If we are "serious researchers," and critical workers, curators, artists, our role is to go back into the analysis and to incorporate other fields in it as well. We also have to take into account other levels. If modernism was actually a moment when

Fredrick Jameson developed a thesis that everything is culture, today everything is science.

This shift is crucial today. This is the biggest difference. Before that, culture was on the "top" and everything had to be conformed to it. This is why Fredrick Jameson stated, "Everything is cultural!" Also it means that politics is/was culture. This changed today, because it had to conform to new rules: new spaces, new territories, and also to new ways of making the surplus value. This is the basic drive of the capitalist machine anyway, and it is in parallel with its new established proprietary relations. Today, the main denominator in society is science and scientific work, in laboratories along with new technologies. This is the reason why we are talking about cloning in terms of art and culture and the genetic paradigm of culture.

Q: We must not forget that all of this is connected with immaterial labor, and that this performativeness is made and is exploited as a form of immaterial labor.

A: The complicity of theory is crucial, because only some writers and cultural producers have the right to establish new interpretations. The center /the first capitalist world/ is the one who produces and actually takes the right to establish the interpretations of other worlds. The intention is to look with power at the process of theoretical writing and its complicity. We can detect a dialectical process between the technology of writing and the politics of publishing. Theory and the industry of theoretical writing are precise pyramidal constructions, carefully safeguarded. Who can publish where and at what time and, moreover, who will provide the first line of interpretation, are extremely important decisions within the capitalist machine. Huge symposia, seminars and panels are organized to support world exhibitions and global cultural projects, so they would always provide for the circulation of the same theoretical personalities and public opinion makers and to represent the reproduction of the capitalist machine in theoretical terms. What I want to say is that immaterial labor is actually what we are doing right now. We are now exchanging freely, like friends. But soon, this will be something that will absolutely be absorbed on a different level and capitalized by the capitalist machine, while we will be left out.

What is at stake here is the question what counts as political and what as technical. I want to be very precise here: I want to emphasize the location of a theory, because it is crucial not to forget one's own complicity in apparatuses of exclusion and inclusion that are constitutive of what may count as the theory/technology of writing and the politics of publishing. Lineage is very important, so is kinship. As Donna Haraway argued, only some "writers" have the semiotic status of authors for any text, as only some actors and "actants" have the status of owners and inventors.

Q: Let's go back to the subject of cultural production. How to reject it, how to avoid it and if it is possible to talk about this at all?

A: The word "production" must also be transformed because of the former established relation to science and technology. Another layer must be given to this word – post – production is therefore "post production."

Q: *Is this matter of immaterial labour?*

A: In one-way yes. So, this postproduction is actually the new modus of production. We are not just translating, clarifying, or just exchanging, but we are really actually doing this as a performative action. While we are translating, we are already producing. While we are talking, the machine is already working – it's already in the process of production. This is the moment when Internet and new technology can be taken as important tools of alternative work, because then you can use this moment of postproduction at its best. We can't think about Internet as a chaotic space anymore – it's based on regulations, laws and economies. Also, a lot of contingent situations are going on that can not be fully controlled by the capitalist repressive machines.

Q: *Actually, you've just started to talk a little bit about the question: What's to be done?*

A: My proposal is the password called "out of being." It is related to Giorgio Agamben's work. Giorgio Agamben in his last book Open. Man and Animal (2002) is actually warning us that maybe it is time to insist on dissolving, or even better to say, a separation of the connection between man and animal. He proposes to cut ties with this constant hybridization. To be left out of the anthropological capitalist machine, not to be part of the constant process of capitalist humanization, therefore to be left out of Being, is maybe the only possible way to have a being. Out of Being is also the sub-title of the last chapter in the already mentioned book by Agamben. Let me go faster, but deeper in establishing a story behind Agamben's proposed "out of being." I can put forward the following thesis. In the modern history of philosophy three books or three positions of thinking marked the way of understanding Being (Sein), which Derrida defines "we and our life":

In 1927 Heidegger published Being and Time.
In 1943 Sartre published Being and Nothingness.
In 1988 Badiou published Being and the Event.
In 2002 Agamben's last chapter in the already mentioned book Open is "Out of Being."

Agamben is therefore the one that provides us with the most radical gesture. He is telling us: to be saved, we have to leave the old anthropological capitalist house! Out of Being! Agamben's out of Being is not the simple gesture of opening the windows within the old anthropological machine. What is important is to understand that this gesture is not the gesture of foreclosure; being drag suddenly in some queer space without time, or out of time. Out of Being simply means to open ourselves toward another temporality. Or, it means to start with a projection of a completely different

film, and not just to waste time, which is Badiou suggestion, with the redefinition of one single (film) sequence, although it can maybe be the initial one.

My interpretation is that Agamben actually tried to lay down an absolute different temporality. "Out of Being" does not mean that you can stop time and space, but to try to put into motion parallel histories, parallel to the first Capitalist system.

Q: Could there be autonomous zones in this space?

A: Absolutely. I think autonomous zones are very important, because they are trying to develop another time and space paradigms anyway. They are not trying to be out of space or neither simply to open the space of the (disturbing) Otherness, but precisely other spaces. In short: "Let's not try to improve a sequence in the film, but let's start with the projection of another film!"

<div style="text-align: right">In Belgrade, 13. 12. 2003.</div>

Struggle for Preservation of the Basic Internet Values

Interview with Cindy Cohn, San Francisco

Question: Could you shortly present Electronic Frontier Foundation and its current activities?

Answer: The Electronic Frontier Foundation is a NGO based in San Francisco, California. We've been around since 1990's, we predate the web and our focus is trying to make sure that our freedoms and rights are at least maintained in digital era, if not expanded. That takes us in a lot of different directions, but we have two main focuses right now: one of them is focusing on the changes in the laws in the United States and all around the world after September 11 and electronic surveillance and governmental censorship and issues that were risen out of the so called war on terrorism and how they affect people online. The other part, which is the part that brings me here, is focusing on the affect that intellectual property law is having on peoples' freedom online, the effect that they are having on innovation and technological development.

Q: There are a lot of organizations that proclaim regulation of copyright laws. One of them is Intellectual Property Association (IIPA), private association of big corporations in USA which are, in the same time, copyright owners for Disney, Time Warner, etc.

A: The Intellectual Property Association, there are a lot of them. But this specific one is just a fringe group for the intellectual property, for the big intellectual property owners, the big entertainments companies and maybe for some software companies as well. Some may say a fringe group, but it takes a group of them, it's their interest. The Intellectual Property Association is really about promoting greater intellectual property rights for owners. The piece of it that is missing from their discussions usually is the recognition that intellectual property has always been viewed as balance, it's not just owners, it's owners and the public. The owners have some rights and the public has some rights and there is a balance that has always been struck. Intellectual property is different then real property – they don't like this fact, but it is true. The easiest way to understand it is the quote from Thomas Jefferson, one of our founding fathers, who says: The beauty of intellectual property is, when I give it to you, I still have it. So, when I light your candle with my candle, my candle is still lit. It makes intellectual property different then the real property and we've always treated it differently. We've always limited the rights that owners had to copying, to public performance and certain another specified rights and everything else belongs to us: the fair use, the things that are falling in the public domain and we can all use them, a private uses of works have always been to the public. What we are seeing with a lot of proposals and the laws that have been passed in US and around the world is that intellectual property

owner's rights are going up and their interests are going up, and the publics rights are going down. So, you have a right to take a snippet – at the opening of the Ars Electronica we saw an artwork that was taking pieces of the speech by George Bush about the war and taking pieces his use of the words 'terror', 'Iraq' and 'weapon' were cut out and copied from the work and put together to make an artistic piece. If the copyright owners had their way, this right, this ability to take snippets of a work out and to recombine them to make the new work of art, won't be possible. So, it's a good example here at art conference how art will be affected by these new rules. But, it's not just art, it's all of us, it's all of our rights that are at stake as this balance shifts more and more out of balance.

Q: There are a lot of cases of bankrupted companies, the owners of copyright, which didn't pass that right to some other body, that could also mean loss of right for repro-duction of copyrighted work. Could we say that copyright law in some cases could damage cultural development?

A: I think that it can be. And it's not just bankruptcy; there are all sorts of reasons why it can become very difficult to find the person whose permission you need to use a work. There was a federal case that went to US Supreme Court called 'Eldred' recent-ly in the United States, and some of the people involved in that case did the survey of the number of copyrighted works that have existed versus the number that are actu-ally still in use. It was tremendously low percentage of copyrighted works that are actually still being used, but yet they are locked up you still can't use them without permission. The copyright holder who may be dead, who may be not found, all sorts of things; even tracing the rights can be very difficult for most recorded music. There are several sets of rights and you have to get every body's permission and that can be very difficult. And the result of this is a tremendous law to us in our culture, because we cannot access these things, people cannt use them, can't play with them they are locked up.

Q: There were hundreds of individual, civil law prosecutions for file sharing on the Internet and for downloading mp3 files in USA. What kind of consequences this act could have on civil liberties at large?

A: In US, there are 261 filed on Monday against individual users in peer-to-peer sys-tems claiming copyright infringements. This is dramatic new tactic by the recording industry. Normally in the past, if the recording industry hasn't liked new technologies, generally they've hate every new technology, they go after creator of new technology. They've tried that with peer-to-peer technology, but they've been pretty unsuccessful. While they were able to step out Napster, many, many others appeared and they've had more trouble in the courts with these second rounds of lawsuits then they did with the first round against the Napster. My organization was represener of one of these companies and we've go ruling from the court saying: You can not declare technology illegal, because it has legal uses and illegal uses and we need to make sure that we don't throw baby out of the bath water, through out legal uses just because there are

some illegal uses. So, recording industry is now taking the next step and they're suiting individuals and the users, and we've learnt that they, in the 261 people that they have suit they've suit twelve year girl, they've suit 67 year old retired man regular, ordinary people. We are facing these disasters lawsuits. It's under traditional copyright law, it's not really new law, it's just a new tactic. The law is pretty supported by the record industry position here. The problem is that the law is bad and we need to fix it. The law was written in an era before everyone had computers, before copying songs were so easy. It was aimed at people who make commercial, people who makes counter fit works, it didn't anticipated individual people may make copies not for profit, which is what most of people at peer-to-peer technology is do they don't make any money, this is not a business. They want to share culture. The laws don't fit this process very well, but we think that the best answer while we were work to try to defend these people, to help those people, because this could be ruin to them. The copyright laws are very draconian. People can be found up to hundred end fifty thousand dollars per song. The average album has 12 to 13 songs on it and if you have just one album, you are facing perhaps about a million dollars worth damage. It is crazy law. We think that the answer is to talk to congress and get this law fixed. There are 60 million people in America alone who use file sharing. That is more people then voted for are president. If those people were to call members of congress: We want to fix this! Then we can fix this. It's a law. You can rewrite laws in America quite easily and congress does it every year. We would like to see the same thing worldwide. There are two hundred million people worldwide who use file-sharing system. We think that they should make a pressure to their own governments to change the copyright laws in order to make sure that this could be legal and to find the way how the artists could be paid. There's a lot of opportunity to do this, there's a lot of pages on the web site called "let the music play" where we've collected all the possible ways that we can think of and that others have thought that we know of to do this. There's a lots of ways. One of the ways is that people have already paid for their ISP for their Internet access, pay 5 dollars extra and that money goes into a fund that gets distributed to the artists. That is one way. There are micro payments that directly pay small amounts of money as a transfer files to the individual. Technology all exists to do this. We just need political will of our lawmakers to make the recording industry to except one of these. Not even except just to make the law and they will have to except it. I think that if we find the way to make this technology legal, we can easily generate much more money then the record industry makes now. Right now, the record industry makes very, very small amount off money. Bill Gates alone could by and sell entire record industry. Intel Corporation makes much more money then the entire recording industry. Computer companies and telecommunications companies are giants compare to the tiny recording industry. They don't make very much money not because people don't love music, but because they haven't been marketing to their audience for the very long time now. They are forcing us to pay 18 dollars for one song that we like and the twelve songs that we don't like. I think that if you didn't force people to pay 18 dollars for one song and you gave them the fair price, they will buy much more music. In fact, most people will prefer to buy their music in the same way they are buying their Internet access. They pay certain amount every month and there's all you

can eat. You can't se any kind of suggestions. The industry is slowly starting to look in these sorts of things, but everything that they word up is locked down and controlled and not very fair to consumers. I think that they need start listening to their audience and finding ways to make money out of this audience and what this audience wants. And I think if they do that, they will make more money then they have ever made before. We have historical example of that when first VCR's were first introduced, the movie company suit to try to get them pulled off the market. They said that it's going to be death of movie industry; they said that it was infringement what people were doing with them because they were taping shows and copying shows. The US Supreme Court said: no! We not are going to let you band this. And the movie industry figured it out they make more money out off video tapes now then they've ever made off of movies and the amount of money that they make off the people actually going to the movie theatres has increased. So, it wasn't like video took away from movies, the whole thing became bigger. And I think the same thing could happen with recording industry and recorded music, because everybody loves music. The problem that the most people have isn't that they don't like music, but that they can't find music that they like in a current market. That's the problem that we should work at.

Q: In USA, there is 301 watch list US Trade Law which represents a list of third world countries with developed piracy and illegal markets, not respecting copyright laws. They are under the direct observation of USA Trade Law. What is general politic of USA towards third world countries when copyright industry is in question?

A: The United States trade position is very much controlled by entertainment companies and they are going all around the world forcing third world countries, very poor countries, to sign agreements and to create laws that don't benefit those countries at all or the citizens of those countries. They basically make sure that more of poor people's money makes it into the hands of Hollywood executives so they can buy their forth house or fifth car or fancy jets, etc. It's not in the interest of these countries to sign these agreements. However, when the United States government is saying: Unless you pass this law and unless you sign this agreement, we're not going to trade agriculture with you, or we're not going to trade textiles with you. These countries have very little choice. I don't think it's reasonable to say to a small country: well, you have to stop all your agriculture or trade with US in order to stand up with copyright principles. That's not fair. I think what the United States is doing is tremendously unfair. It's not fair to those little countries to force them to subsidize Hollywood. As we know, most of the Hollywood movies, when they are available around the world are not priced at what poor countries can afford. They priced very, very high. So, it's no surprise that people are going to find way to not pay that price, because they cannot afford it. A month salary for a movie is not realistic thing to ask people to pay. At the certain extent, I don't contrail a piracy, I think that you have to look the whole picture and the reason that they are thriving pirate market around the world is, in part, because this industry is very unrealistic in the way that they market products around the world, and they bare some responsibilities for this. And to turn around and go cry-

ing to the United States government and half the government force these small countries to sign draconian laws, and this exactly is about to go wrong way. I suppose that something similar is happening with your country as well.

In Linz, 07. 09. 2003.

Transcription of the interview is not authorized.

About Tactical Media and Art Production

Interview with Steve Kurtz, Critical Art Ensemble, USA

Question: Can you tell us about your beginnings, origins, influences, education, about the idea of starting such a collective, and about your present position in society?

Answer: To begin from the beginning, Critical Art Ensemble started in 1986, but as we know it now, as a collective, in 1987. It originally started as a video group, and we expanded from there. At the time, all of us were graduate students, all getting our advanced degrees, and we weren't satisfied with what the institution was providing us. It was teaching us to be specialists, to work really hard, to forget about the world outside and focus on our studies. And it seemed that they had a very narrow concept of what study could be, whether it was in art, humanities, social sciences, or sciences. And we just didn't feel like it was fulfilling what we wanted. Yet, as individuals, we felt very powerless in terms of what could be done about it. But, when a number of us came together, we had enough resources to begin representing an alternative solution. A lot of the early projects we did had to do with organizing activities within our own town, which was a small college town called Tallahassee, Florida. We thought how we could do something different and find a way to express the things that concerned us, such as being able to have a freer range of exploration and not just to listen to: "This is what art is, and this is what it's not." The art college was very limited, and it was mostly guided by the market. What would be successful in the art market in New York was what made you a good artist. Since we were a lot younger then, we were really worried about of what we could do and what was really possible for us. For the most part, we were being taught that nothing was possible. You followed the market flow and you found your place. Otherwise, it was just going to be a hopeless case. We refused to believe in that and that's what made us form a group. That's when we said: "This is the end of any individuated artist career. That's not going to work! We had to build an alternative power base, and if we all put our skills and brains, power and money, and whatever else we had together, we probably could survive and perhaps build some type of a public platform for ourselves." It was a very slow staircase effect that we went through. There was certainly no immediate breakthrough. It was a lot of learning on the job, because there was no place else for us to learn about it. We just had to learn it by practicing it.

The second thing was the question of agency. We just felt that the authority of the American style, "friendly fascism", was so overwhelming, that this was the primary element in culture that we had to respond to. We couldn't leave it alone and pretend that it wasn't there. And that particular theme, making our own situations, responding to what takes them away – institutions, cultures, classes, whatever it may be – is what we responded to and refused to accept. That was really the glue that held us

together, in spite of the fact we came from very different disciplines and places. We could all agree on that point and we could construct our practice as a means to survive that type of authoritarian imposition.

Q: Were there any changes in the structure of the group over time?

A: There have been changes. In the first year, we didn't really know what we were doing, so we weren't very successful. We started with seven people, and five left after the first year, so there was Steve Barns and me to continue the work. Then we got four new people, and it stayed like that until 1993. There is something that people forget when forming groups. They think that it is just going to be a group work, but it's not! You have to be able to put up with all the other peoplees characters. There has to be some type of non-rational relationship among the group members that feel solidarity with one another, beyond mere work. Otherwise, it will never work in the long-term.

Q: What is your position now? Would you identify yourself as an artist, lecturer, educator, activist, or something in between?

A: Yes, we're all of these. From the beginning, we never believed in a singularity of role. Nobody acts like that. People come up and always ask: "What do you do?". Sometimes it's easier to say: "I'm an artist", because you don't want to go through the explanation saying: "I'm a hybrid" or "I'm a tactical media practitioner" or any of the other words we could use to describe ourselves. But, it seems clear to me that we play many different roles in our lives, and there are many different knowledge systems we interact with, and there are many different methodologies to accomplish things, that we use in the course of a lifetime, or even in the course of a day. We're in transition all the time. So, in terms of what we are considered to be, well, I don't necessarily consider myself an artist. I don't consider myself a scientist or an activist, but some combination of different elements of these various specializations that intersect through me and the group, as well as different intensities, which are changing all the time depending on the environment that I'm in. I'm very susceptible to what the environment brings out most. Sometimes I'm more of an activist, sometimes more of an artist, sometimes I'm more science oriented, sometimes I'm more theory oriented. It just depends on where we are, whom we are talking to, and what problem needs to be solved at the moment.

Q: And when you talk about the artistic environment, how do you feel in that system of values, as a kind of global art scene? Do you find it useful in any way?

A: It's definitely useful. It's a tremendous way to milk money from the machine. In terms of being a part of it, it's a very strange relationship. The subject they invite in might not be something they really want around. However, it's useful. So you invite it in, you don't let it stay too long, and then you send it back to where it came from. We do not seem to be very rooted in it, but we pass through it quite a bit, and usually it's

rather hospitable that way. If you stay there long enough to start messing up the mechanisms of the institutions, you're shown the door very quickly.

Q: Do you consider yourself some kind of a décor at the moment?

A: Yes, they invite me, but there is an exchange of capital! It's a negotiation, and we're both trying to negotiate to get what benefits us most.

Q: Do you participate in big shows, such as contemporary American art exhibitions?

A: We have participated in some big shows, but we tend to stay away from such things.

Q: With information technology and opening of communication channels, there are a lot of expectations in terms of this technology – that it will liberate us, that this technology will bring the new democracy, that it is the new freedom and everything else. However, what we all see at this moment is that a lot of these expectations were wrong, at the least. My question is: "Do you think that this information technology still has a power and enough energy to produce the changes in this society? "

A: First, the expectations were manufactured. They always have been. Every time a new technology comes along, there's a series of promises that go with it and never materialize. But, that's how the manufacturers are going to benefit most. They started by naming: liberation, freedom, democracy, new community, etc. These had been the standard promises that never really quite happened. A lot of our work in the mid '90s was about: "Don't believe this! Don't believe this hype!" And it's not that we didn't think that something good could happen. We just believed that with the way market and corporate forces were lining up, it was highly unlikely that it was going to happen. I do think that there are options to answer your question that the use of technology can cause a profound, positive change in society in regards to issues like the quality of freedom of expression. I don't think it will ever be revolutionary. I don't think that's going to happen, but this does not mean that it is completely empty. There are still plenty of places like subversive behavior, temporary autonomous zones, free situations that can come out of that. And we only have to look at history to see that sometimes it had been better then in other times. And that is what Guy Debord says: "The most important characteristic of the revolutionary is patience!", i.e. to know when the moment comes and to act upon it. For the most part, things are bad, but that doesn't mean that even in the worst of totalitarian situations there cannot be healthy undergrounds and healthy places where subversion occurs. That also doesn't mean that moments would come where things could be made a lot better, that personal autonomy could be expanded all of a sudden. And I will follow with an aphorism: "Pessimism of the mind, optimism of the will" I think it's a battle worth fighting, but it's not over, it's not empty and the case is not lost.

Q: Do you think that technology had a natural potential for changing the environment? That means that if you have communication, technology, knowledge about the technology (especially digital technology), you have the ability to build your free environment and to change it. I don't know if we could precisely spot the historical moment when that change happens. That opportunity might still be here.

A: It is still here.

Q: There is one thing about technology. Technology is always one step ahead. It's constantly improving. The system can only follow the technology, because the technology is always new. In the beginning of any particular technology increment, only few people know about that. Everything else, except for the technology, is incorporated easily right into the system, which is slower and can be put in hierarchy. Take the University as an example of a system and University professors as exponents of the power within it. Within any science like humanities, social science, chemistry, architecture etc., a University teacher is really powerful, because of the firm, stable and established hierarchy. He can actually choose what or who will go up and what or who will go down. But, in the information, digital technology, only few of the University professors can follow the development. They are left behind, because of the speed, so they have lesser influence on the research and researchers. There is a weak, if any, hierarchy and it is always changing.

A: Yes, but there are so many levels that you're addressing. It's difficult to say. First is the level on which we are talking about technology as something new. No one really knows how to make it work to the benefit of a particular group. That is a really great time. It's one of those moments where a subversive action can really have a profound effect. I don't know if it will last. With the Internet right now, the subversive action is kind of loosening at this point. But, in the early '90s, it did quite well before it was realized how property law and various kinds of laws can be used to stop the resistance. But now, it's going the other way. At the same time, there is a lot of confusion at large. The old industrial elite wonnt go without a fight. We can see that in America right now. What's going on now is an attempt of the old industrial class to reassert itself and its primacy in the world. For manufacturers, in this case, the oil is the primary thing – not the control of information. There is a kind of a fight going on between the virtual class and the old industrial class – the clash is still on. During those times of conflict, there were a lot of openings for subversive behavior to move in. It's not so solidified yet. The laws have been written, the protocols are all in place and there's a definite hierarchy in the chain of command that rules the communication space. At the same time, there's still a great deal of struggle going on, and within that struggle there are ways to get in and make an effect. Now, the poor University professors… I don't know if they were ever as powerful as you make them out to be. They are people caught in the middle, particularly in the technological environment.

Q: They are very powerful here. We might even say that about Europe in general.

A: Well, in the US they are not because they are stuck in this place, as they have to raise money to keep their research centers going, and no one is going to give them money, unless they can show how they are going to give the money back. Basically, they have one narrow band of power. In that context, they have the authority to say what's knowledge and what's not. But, when it really comes to it, if they cannot put together an institute that is going to make money for the people that are investing in that institute, they are not going to be primary investigators for long. They are going to be fired, unless they answer to these needs. They are not totally free agents. They have a class they have to answer to, and they struggle on a daily basis. It's one of the most difficult jobs ever, to try to answer to those people up on the scale, who are providing the funds for these incredibly expensive initiatives.

Q: *It's a matter of a well-developed system in America, which is extremely market oriented in a material way. In Europe, a professor's position is much more secured. When they become professors they are protected for life.*

A: Well, you might hold your job, but that's different from being someone with power. These aren't the same things. The same is in the US. If you fail as a scientist, then you are tenure, you get to keep your job, but no one is going to give you money anymore. They are just going to have you teach freshmen, and that's your job. You'll just be pushed on the margins. But you'll keep your job.

Q: *What are your experiences as a lecturer?*

A: Being a professor? I'm teaching in Buffalo. I started at the Carnegie Mellon University, which is a very big computer science, robotics, technically oriented school. My experience there was very bad. They tried to fire me from the day I set foot on that campus. They did not want anything I brought there. So, it was quite difficult. I did get tenure finally. Then I quit. They feared I had no liability to the University because corporations and government agencies that were funding the University found out about the work I was doing. They were afraid that they would lose some of their funding rounds.

Q: *It's all about money.*

A: Almost. When you mentioned that technology researches are ahead of the system, they are always one step ahead. The direction that the research is going in is defined by the system. In the US, it seems that you can only do it if you get certain amount of money. Who gives you the money? It's the government and the corporations. In terms of technology, most of it comes from the military, but professors are really stuck with that. I believe, that their power is, if you might say that, in the realm of pedagogical issues. They might be able to provide some kind of models to their students and thus show them how you can use what you've learned for other purposes. But there are only few professors who are interested in that or willing to do that. So, it's really a small role they can play. At Carnegie Mellon that was very apparent because they

were mostly a corporation-funded University. Most of the main tech schools are. This one was a practical University. It has two main things: the technology and fine arts. It was really odd. And though they had social science that was not their strong point. In the early '60s, the US government decided they were not able to reproduce work force fast enough so that the needs of technological research can be met. They poured tons of money into MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Carnegie Mellon and California Institute of Technology, to make sure that high end technocrats were being produced at a fast enough pace.

Q: Let's go back to the theoretical, critical level. How do you feel in terms of cultural critique in the present historical moment when history is changing very fast? You have written "The Electronic Civil Disobedience" and published it in 1995. From that moment up to the present, have you felt a real change in its relation to the surrounding context?

A: I think it can still be a social critique. What is more difficult is the implementation of these theories. They'll let you write all the theory you want to write. The problem begins when someone tries it out. No, I don't think it's really any harder at this point. If you stay in the realm of education, pedagogy and theory, then it's fine. If you start doing things, that's when it becomes much more difficult these days.

Q: Have you ever tried to implement practical ideas from that article? Have you ever had any trouble with the law because of all the 'problematic' issues it deals with?

A: From "The Electronic Civil Disobedience"? No. As we said in the article, we didn't have the coding skills to do it the way we had envisioned them. Lots of other people took up the model and did it. In that particular case, when we wrote that article, we knew we didn't have the skill, we just had the model. That's what we presented, thinking that those with the technical skill, familiar with the model, would carry it out. And it happened to some degree. From the present perspective, though, what we were suggesting then is such a serious federal crime, for which someone would go to jail for a long time, in spite of the fact that they wouldn't be doing anything. I don't know if anyone would do it at this point. I think the only people doing extreme hacking like that are criminals. We had problems with the law, usually because of the activities that we were doing in a media sense. We havennt had any trouble virtually. It wasn't a digital thing. It was the things we were doing on the street that caused us have legal problems. Sometimes we weren't even intentionally trying to make a problem, and yet, there was a problem.

Q: How do you feel about the "new left" back in the 60's, now and about the whole idea of the left? For example, Zizek writes there is no vision of progress, or optimism on the "left", so that is one of the reasons the "right" ideas and "right" parties are getting stronger and becoming more visible and closer to people in Europe. The "Leftist" politics is not so fresh anymore, and that appears to be one of the main problems.

A: I don't know if I necessarily agree with that. The "new left" was inspirational in a way. They were the first wave of serious refusal. They managed to turn that onto the popular front. That was going on in the post-war society, and it gives them some credit. Eventually, they outlived their time, because they were reacting to a context that was dramatically changing. In the work that we do, the situations were very important to us, not because we are countermarxists, but because they understood that if you were going to do this kind of cultural/political resistance, then it had to be more then just a project. There had to be a theoretical underpinning, there had to be a language that articulated what you were doing, as well. That was one of the things we saw as really important when we started. We looked around, and no one really had the articulation. They were either doing the theory, or they were doing the projects. There was the sense that the "new left" resented our practice, somehow got left behind, and we thought that was something we needed to resurrect again. So, in that sense, I'm quite sympathetic. I see them as inspirational in many ways. If you take them in their context, it was very important work at that moment. And why is the "right" doing better? Is that because of the bad corner the "left" has pinned themselves into, and they don't know what to do with the category of "utopia"? They know they can't have it, because it tends to universalize, and when it universalizes it immediately excludes people, and that's not what they want. They want a holistic, multitudinous movement, a real popular front. For those who are in an uncertain position, it is necessary to have a fairly concrete vision of what you're heading to, when someone comes along, like the „right" and says: "This is what we want. We want nationalist pride, and we're going to build this kind of state!" The "left" doesn't want to come out and say that, and in some way it shouldn't. It is the collision between a theoretical position and a difficult ethical proposition versus the practical. And no one'es really figured out how to get out of this yet.

Q: Talking about being visible, there are those popular "leftist" faces. Recently, I've seen the movie "Bowling for Columbin" by Michael Moore. There is a certain common conclusion that the movie is unpleasant for "the system" because it deals with "very problematic" issues, such as guns in shops, violence in schools, NRA, etc. But sometimes – I am not sure whether you'll agree with me as it's very simplified – I think that the system, the hierarchy, is counting on those faces, they are part of the system. In some way, the system is controlling them. Balibard said that the ruling classes are keeping their position by adopting the ideas from "the underground". That's the way, let's say, Roman Empire adopted Christianity. What do you think about that?

A: Well, we're all in the system at this point. I do believe that you can still take it in a technical sense. As you previously mentioned, there is something new emerging, and it hasn't solidified yet into a specific power structure. It hasn't turned into that kind of singularity. There can be a sense of avant-gardism, in terms of having someone steping outside the system and being able to see a "new dawn". As for the optimism question, I think that the "leftt" has a lot of optimism. The problem is that it's non-specific. You can read about it in numerous authors, whether it's Hardt and Negri's "Empire" or

something else. They say: "Well, look, there is this plane of possibility that is out there, and on that horizon there are alternatives." Well, people hear that and say: "Great, but what does that mean?" And to someone who is not comfortable with the idea of indeterminacy as the place of resistance and optimism, it's almost meaningless. That's where the problem really comes in. The "right" got a plan which is very simple. Michael Moore's message is so confusing. The guy doesn't know what he wants. But, there will always be popular resistance politicians. I am glad there are Michael Moores in the world, but in some way, there is a problematic side to that as well, because there is no consistency to their argument. A lot of it is emotionally related, which is not necessarily helpful in the long run. It works well in the short run, but in the long term – it unravels very fast.

Q: There is one more question, which is about specialization in the digitalization realm. Right now, there are many specialists in everything – all kinds of specialists that are not communicating with each other. Do you think that problems, such as the lack of criticism in the society or the lack of subversive actions, are based on this specification? The second part of the question would be: do you feel that some kind of 'new' generalization is coming – that one person will again be able to address all kinds of specializations? After all, do you think that the issue of specialization is one of the main problems in the general treatment of knowledge, and do you feel that possibility for collecting different "virtues" in one person is some kind of the renaissance that will come soon?

A: We've written on this subject quite a bit. We think of specialization as a structural problem. It's the very cause of alienation. It is built right into the system, and to some degree has been intentionalized and intensified, specifically for that reason. That's one of the ways in which the enlightenment management of knowledge has helped to maintain a certain type of order. That's really the key thing. This is part of the reason why we stepped away from it. Regarding the possibility of having a renaissance man that will make these communications possible, I don't believe in that. I think it's just too complicated at this point. What we can have, and what we advocate is an amateur that will make these connections possible. The bad thing is that the word amateur has always been used to refer to the people who want to chase off from specializations as they don't belong in there. But, I think it's time for the revolution in terms of switching to the other ways. That is the form in which a renaissance person can occur within the extreme complexity we live in now. And certainly, that's what we are fighting for, to try to make this things interconnect. We can't do it from the perspective of an expert, but from the perspective of an interloper. Thus, we might see things the way they see them and import questions into specialization that we would not be asked otherwise. That is how we might make some kind of effect building that hybridizing role which can start making these connections. It is a very new model of an amateur. Also, it's not the "person specific", but the "group specific".

Q: If you want to go to some vertical industry and to speak to an expert, you will have the problem to explain to him things that you are doing, because he doesn't know

anything about what is important globally. Do you think that some kind of new education is necessary – education for experts, which will help them recognize problems in general, the global situation, his/her part within that and possibly participation in the change of the situation?

A: Everyone knows it already. That the enlightenment model of specialization is at such a point of alienation, and such a point of knowledge explosion, that the architecture can no longer hold the weight of the information it's producing. Thus, it's collapsing, particularly because of the communication gaps. I think there is a call that most professors and people in the institutions understand. It is the need for some type of interdisciplinary education. The problem is that it's very difficult to revise an institution. They are designed not to change, and it's an ongoing battle. But at least, we're at the point where the language is being used. It's not being implemented very well, but maybe it will start to move that way.

In conversation with Vladimir Maruna & Vladimir Tupanjac
in Novi Sad,16. 04. 2003.

Transcription of the interview is not authorized.

Index of the Authors

Geert Lovink (NL)

Geert Lovink, media theorist, net critic and activist, studied political science on the university of Amsterdam. He is member of "Adilkno", The Foundation for the Advancement of Illegal Knowledge, a free association of media-related intellectuals established in 1983. He is a former editor of the media art magazine "Mediamatic" (1989-94) and has been teaching and lecturing media theory throughout Central and Eastern Europe. He is a co-founder of the Amsterdam-based free community network "Digital City" and the support campaign for independent media in South-East Europe "Press Now". He was the co-organizer of conferences such as "Wetware" (1991), "Next Five Minutes" 1-3 (93-96-99), "Metaforum" 1-3 (Budapest 94-96), "Ars Electronica" (Linz, 1996/98) and "Interface 3" (Hamburg 95). In 1995, together with Pit Schultz, he founded the international „Nettime" circle which is both a mailinglist (in English, Dutch, French, Spanish/Portuguese, Romanian and Chinese). In early 2001 he co-founded, a forum for Australian Internet research and culture which has its first publication out, launched at the first "Fibreculture" meeting in Melbourne (december 2001).

Sarai and **Raqs Media Collective** (IN)

Sarai is a programme of the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS), Delhi, initiated in 2000. The Sarai programme acts as a public space, where different intellectual and creative energies can intersect in an open and dynamic manner to give rise to an imaginative practice of research into urban realities, new/old media practice publication and critical cultural intervention. The Sarai programme was initiated by the Raqs Media together with Ravi Sundaram and Ravi Vasudevan (faculty, CSDS) in 2000. Raqs is based in the Media Lab at Sarai where they research and make work in various media, installations, video, sound, photography and text.

http://www.sarai.net
http://www.raqsmediacollective.net

Saskia Sassen (NL/USA)

Saskia Sassen is the Ralph Lewis Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago, and Centennial Visiting Professor at the London School of Economics. She is currently completing her forthcoming book "Denationalization: Economy and Polity in a Global Digital Age" (Princeton University Press 2003) based on her five year project on governance and accountability in a global economy. Her most recent books are "Guests and Aliens" (New York: New Press 1999) and her edited book "Global Networks/Linked Cities" (New York and London: Routledge

2002). The Global City is out in a new fully updated edition in 2001. Her books have been translated into ten languages. She is co-director of the Economy Section of the Global Chicago Project, a Member of the National Academy of Sciences Panel on Urban Data Sets, a Member of the Council of Foreign Relations, and Chair of the newly formed Information Technology, International Cooperation and Global Security Committee of the SSRC.

http://www.law.uchicago.edu/faculty/sassen/

Marcus Neustetter (SA)

Marcus Neustetter has been developing projects addressing the relationship between art and technology. These take the form of mobile, installation, and web artworks tackling the translation of data through different online and offline platforms. In this process he has been exploring the digital and analogue ways of representing virtual experiences. Marcus Neustetter has exhibited and been actively involved in developing opportunities and platforms for local digital art through projects in South Africa and Europe, these include ARS Electronica (Austria), Transmadiale.03 (Germany) and E-tester (Spain). Local projects have also focused on curated digital art exhibitions, community research and training programmes and lectures and seminars. As director (with Stephen Hobbs) of the trinity session and Sanman (Southern African New Media Art Network) and The Gallery PREMISES, Marcus Neustetter is actively involved in developing cultural industry strategies through a range of projects informed by cultural and ICT industry experience in South Africa and research conducted for the ILO on the Visual Arts and Crafts Industries in the SADC region. Currently he is developing the UNESCO Digi-Arts Africa network strategy.

http://onair.co.za/mn/cv.html

Bureau d'Etudes (FR)

Founded in 1998, the Paris-based Bureau d'Etudes is a media artists group. Bureau d'Etudes concentrates on mapping various issues of world governance and also contributes to Université Tangente, research about autonomous knowledge in Strasbourg. With its work Bureau d'Etudes develops pictographic installations that deal with themes such as networks of data-gathering systems, biowar and global resistance movements. They visualize the distribution of power in its various forms – political, cultural and financial – on a global basis and show the relationships between the different actors involved.

www.universite-tangente.fr.st

Marina Grzinic (SI)

> **Marina Grzinic Mauhler** PhD, researcher at the Institute of Philosophy of the Scientific and Research Centre of The Slovenian Academy of Science and Art, Ljubljana. She also works as a freelance-curator, critic and media theoretician. Together with Aine Smid, she has been involved in creation of video-projects, short films, installations, web-sites and CD ROMS since the early eighties.

> www.ljudmila.org/quantum.east/
> www.eda.ucla.edu/events/spring01/mauhler/mauhler.htm

Cindy Cohn (SAD)

> **Cindy Cohn** is the Legal Director for the Electronic Frontier Foundation. She is responsible for overseeing the EFF's overall legal strategy. EFF has been actively involved in nearly all areas where civil liberties are impacted online. EFF has focused in the past few years on two major challenges – first the impact of changes to the law in the aftermath of the September 11th tragedy and second, on the challenge to the rights of Internet users presented by recent changes to intellectual property laws.

> http://www.eff.org/

Steve Kurtz (USA)

> **Steve Kurtz** is Associate Professor in the Art Department of University of Buffalo. Kurtz holds a PhD in Interdisciplinary Humanities, and before coming to UB was an Associate Professor of Art at Carnegie Mellon University. He is a founding member of internationally acclaimed art and theory group Critical Art Ensemble (CAE). CAE is a collective of five tactical media practitioners of various special-izations, who focus on the exploration of the intersections between art, critical theory, technology, and political activism. The collective has performed and pro-duced a wide variety of projects for an international audience at diverse venues ranging from the street, to the museum, to the Internet. Critical Art Ensemble has also written five books: Their most recent work is "The Molecular Invasion" (Autonomedia, 2002).

> http://www.critical-art.net

kuda.org – social implications of new media

New Media Center kuda.org is an organization which brings together artists, theoreticians, media activists, researchers and the wider public in the field of Information and Communication Technologies. In this respect, kuda.org is dedicated to the research of new cultural relations, contemporary artistic practice, and social issues.

Kuda.org's work focuses on questions concerning the influence of the electronic media on society, on the creative use of new communication technologies, and on contemporary cultural and social policy. Some of the main issues include interpretation and analysis of the history and significance of the information society, the potential of information itself, and the diffusion of its influence on political, economic and cultural relationships in contemporary society.

The development of new communication technologies has brought about numerous changes in contemporary society, touching the political, social, and cultural realms. The Internet, processes of applying new technologies and new models of communication via the "networking" process and the development of critical thinking towards the above, have become part of our everyday lives. A large body of researchers, theoreticians, programmers, critics and media activists are devoted to the research and explanation of the global phenomena of our time and their consequences.

New Media Center kuda.org opens space for both cultural dialog and alternative methods of education and research. Social questions, media culture, new technologies art, and the Open Source and Free Software principle are areas in which kuda.org is engaged.

Programs:

kuda.info / infocenter

Provides information in the field of new media, contemporary art, social phenomena, research and education by means of a library, mediatheque and digital archive. In addition information is disseminated about cultural events, seminars , call for proposals (inter(nationally. For all visitors of kuda.org Internet is free as a free beer.

kuda.lounge / presentation and lectures

Consists of lectures, workshops, talks, public presentations of artists, media activists, theorists, scientists and researchers. kuda.lounge is a place of active participatory dialog. From 2000 onwards over 100 events have been organised . The center boasts its own venue for public events and workshops (real time recording of programs, digital archiving and Internet uploading).

kuda.production / production and publishing

Creates a matrix for non-profit artistic production in the field of new media and technologies, interdisciplinary research and experiment. In 2003 collaborations have been with a.o. Institute of New Cultural Technologies Public Netbase Vienna, and with the Museum of Contemporary Art Belgrade. kuda.org has organized the Serbian edition of the exhibition World-Information.Org. From 2004 onwards kuda.org offers free web space on the kuda server for artists, activists and the NGO sector.

New Media Center **kuda.org**
Braće Mogin 2, PO Box 22
Detelinara, 21113 Novi Sad
Serbia and Montenegro
tel/fax: +381 21 512 227
mail: office@kuda.org
url: http://www.kuda.org