

OGRANIČENO KRETANJE KULTURNE PROIZVODNJE¹ Mogućnosti društvenog angažmana u umjetnosti iz perspektive razvoja kulturnih industrija u Sloveniji²



14 LIDIJA
KRIŽNER-
RADOJEVIĆ

CONSTRAINED MOTION OF CULTURAL PRODUCTION¹ Possibilities for social engagement in art from the perspective of developing cultural industries in Slovenia²

PRETHODNO PRIOPĆENJE

PREDAN: 18. 3. 2015.

PRIHVAĆEN: 18. 4. 2015.

UDK: UDK 7 UDC 304:338

SAŽETAK: Iako se politički ili društveni angažman individualnog umjetnika obično smatra pitanjem osobnog (i slobodnog) izbora, taj je izbor uvjetovan širim društvenim kontekstom koji izgrađuju određene institucije i pravila. Iz te su perspektive institucionalne promjene iznimno važne za politički i društveni angažman umjetnika. Analiza u ovom članku fokusira se na ključne institucionalne promjene koje su se dogodile na kulturnom polju u Sloveniji od početka 1990-ih godina. Širenje kapitalističkih odnosa u Sloveniji, kao dio većeg procesa globalnoga kapitalističkog restrukturiranja od kraja 1980-ih godina, pokrenulo je institucionalnu promjenu koja je promijenila ulogu kulturne sfere i njezinih društveno-političkih utjecaja. Razvoj kapitalističkih odnosa u kulturi sve do nedavno objavljenoga *Nacionalnog programa za kulturu* koji kulturu definira kao proizvod kulturnih ili kreativnih industrija može se podijeliti na dva razdoblja. Tijekom devedesetih godina prošloga stoljeća glavni društveni rezultati institucionalnog preformiranja odnosili su se na uvođenje tržišno-poduzetničkog modela, dok su institucionalne promjene iz 2000-ih godina omogućile postsocijalističkoj Sloveniji integraciju u globalnu kapitalističku regulaciju u sferi kulture.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: institucionalna promjena, kapitalistički odnosi, kulturna proizvodnja, država, tržište.

Uloga umjetnosti u emancipacijskim društvenim pokretima, politički ili društveni angažman umjetnika, kao i njihov utjecaj u današnjim kapitalističkim društvima postaju sve važnija tema suvremene kritičke teorije umjetnosti³. Tom se pitanju pridaje osobita pažnja i u postsocijalističkoj Sloveniji⁴, ponajprije zbog njezina specifičnoga društvenog i povijesnog naslijeđa⁵ koje je u mnogim aspektima proturječno suvremenom razvoju kulturne proizvodnje. Prema novome *Nacionalnom programu za kulturu*⁶ 2014. – 2017. (s podnaslovom *Put prema novom modelu kulturne politike*) kultura je zamišljena kao produkt kulturnih ili kreativnih industrija. Ovim se strateškim dokumentom predlaže preispitivanje/preslagivanje u smjeru „razvoja kulturnih tržišta“ i „vladinih inicijativa za stvaranje kulturnih i kreativnih industrija“, čime bi se garantiralo „optimalno funkcioniranje cijeloga kulturnog sustava“⁷. Razvoj kulturnih ili kreativnih industrija zahtijeva snažno razvijene i društveno integrirane tržišne odnose, koji čine osnovu učinkovitoga kulturnog tržišta i ostvarivanja novčanog prihoda od kulturne potrošnje. Pritom je također nužna komodifikacija, odnosno pretvaranje faktora proizvodnje (radne snage u kulturi, kulturne infrastrukture itd.) i proizvoda (kulturnih/umjetničkih dobara) u robu za tržište. No ponajprije je nužna zajednička percepcija kulture kao ekonomske aktivnosti. …… U posljednja tri desetljeća kulturna je proizvodnja prošla proces radikalne reorganizacije.

PRELIMINARY PAPER

RECEIVED: MARCH 3RD 2015ACCEPTED: APRIL 18TH 2015

UDC: UDK 7 UDC 304:338

ABSTRACT: Although political or social engagement of an individual artist is normally considered as a matter of personal (and free) choice, his or her decision is conditioned by a wider social context created by institutions and rules. From this perspective the institutional changes are of particular importance if one is to consider the question of political or social engagement of an artist. The analysis in the article focuses on the major institutional changes in the field of culture in Slovenia since the beginning of the 1990s. The expansion of capitalist relations in Slovenia, which was part of the broader process of global capitalist restructuring since the end of the 1980s, initiated the institutional change that altered the role of the cultural sphere and its socio-political effects. Up to the recent *National Culture Programme* that defines the future culture in Slovenia as the product of the cultural or creative industry, the development of capitalist relations in the field of culture could be divided in two periods. The main social effect of the institutional reframing in the 1990s has been the introduction of the market entrepreneurial model, whereas the institutional changes in the 2000s enabled post-socialist Slovenia to integrate into the global capitalist regulation of the cultural sphere.

KEYWORDS: institutional change, capitalist relations, cultural production, state, market.

The role of art in social emancipatory movements, the political or social engagement of an artist, as well as its social effect in today's capitalist societies are becoming an important topic in the contemporary critical art theory³. This issue has received particular attention also in post-socialist Slovenia⁴, mostly because of its specific socio-historical legacy⁵ that in many directions stands in opposition to the contemporary development of cultural production. According to the new *National Culture Programme*⁶ 2014–2017, subtitled *Towards a New Model of Cultural Policy*, the future culture in Slovenia should be the product of the cultural or creative industry. This strategic document proposes an overhaul in the direction of “developing cultural markets” and “governmental initiatives for creating cultural and creative industries,” which should warrant “the optimum functioning of the whole system of culture.”⁷ The development of cultural or creative industry requires highly developed and socially integrated market relations, which are the base for an effective cultural market and a monetized cultural consumption. It also demands the commodification of the factors of production (cultural labour force, cultural infrastructure etc.) and products (cultural/art-objects). But above all it requires the common perception of culture as an economic activity. …… The field of cultural production has been radically reorganised in the last three

Ekspanzija kapitalističkih odnosa u Sloveniji, kao dio šireg procesa globalnoga kapitalističkog restrukturiranja od kraja 1980-ih godina, pokrenula je institucionalnu promjenu koja je transformirala ulogu kulturne sfere i njezin društveni i politički utjecaj. Institucionalnom reorganizacijom kulture ostvaren je značajan utjecaj na proizvodnju i redistribuciju kulturnih dobara, kao i na oblikovanje političkog interesa kulturnih proizvođača. Nakon duge javne rasprave, *Nacionalni program za kulturu* podržali su i predstavnici kulturnih radnika. Iako se politički ili društveni angažman individualnog umjetnika obično smatra

**RAZVOJ KULTURNIH ILI KREATIVNIH
INDUSTRIJA ZAHTIJEVA SNAŽNO
RAZVIJENE I DRUŠTVENO INTEGRIRANE
TRŽIŠNE ODNOSI, KOJI ČINE
OSNOVU UČINKOVITOGA KULTURNOG
TRŽIŠTA. PRITOM JE TAKOĐER
NUŽNA KOMODIFIKACIJA, ODNOSNO
PRETVARANJE FAKTORA PROIZVODNJE
I PROIZVODA U ROBU ZA TRŽIŠTE. NO
PONAJPRIJE JE NUŽNA ZAJEDNIČKA
PERCEPCIJA KULTURE KAO
EKONOMSKE AKTIVNOSTI.**

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL OR
CREATIVE INDUSTRY REQUIRES HIGHLY
DEVELOPED AND SOCIALLY INTEGRATED
MARKET RELATIONS, WHICH ARE THE BASE
FOR AN EFFECTIVE CULTURAL MARKET AND
A MONETIZED CULTURAL CONSUMPTION.
IT ALSO DEMANDS THE COMMODIFICATION
OF THE FACTORS OF PRODUCTION AND
PRODUCTS. BUT ABOVE ALL IT REQUIRES
THE COMMON PERCEPTION OF CULTURE AS
AN ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.**

decades. The expansion of capitalist relations in Slovenia that was part of the broader process of global capitalist restructuring since the end of the 1980s, initiated the institutional change that altered the role of the cultural sphere and its socio-political effects. The institutional reorganisation of culture had a significant impact on the production and the redistribution of cultural goods, as well as an influence on the formation of the political interest of cultural producers. After a long public debate, the *National Culture Program* was approved also by the representatives of cultural workers. Although political or social engagement of an individual artist is normally considered as a matter of personal (and free) choice, his or her decision is conditioned by a wider social context created by institutions

pitanjem osobnog (i slobodnog) izbora, taj je izbor uvjetovan širim društvenim kontekstom koji izgrađuju određene institucije i pravila. Iz te su perspektive institucionalne promjene iznimno važne za politički i društveni angažman umjetnika. Stoga se ova analiza fokusira na ključne institucionalne promjene koje su se dogodile na kulturnom polju u Sloveniji od početka 1990-ih godina.

Institucionalna promjena u globalnom kapitalizmu

Poimanje kulture u socijalističkoj Sloveniji nije se povezivalo s ekonomskim razmišljanjima, stoga je bio potreban dug proces društvene transformacije kako bi se normalizirala takva ideološka pozicija. U tom su procesu institucionalne promjene odigrale ključnu ulogu, s obzirom na to da se razumijevanje kulture među pojedincima, kao i zajednička percepcija kulture u društvu, oblikuje kroz širi institucionalni okvir⁸. Institucije reguliraju društvene odnose koji su dio društva te istovremeno pojedincima omogućuju da u tim odnosima sudjeluju⁹. Na taj način institucije uspostavljaju društvo kao stabilnu i kompletnu strukturu i pojedince čine članovima društva. U kapitalističkom uređenju institucije su rezultat borbe koja se odvija između društvenih sila koje favoriziraju širenje tržišta i rastuću komodifikaciju društvenih odnosa s jedne strane i društvenih zahtjeva za političkom stabilizacijom i stabilnim svijetom

and rules. From this perspective the institutional changes are of particular importance if one is to consider the question of political or social engagement of an artist. Thus, the analysis focuses on the major institutional changes in the field of culture in Slovenia since the beginning of the 1990s.

Institutional change in global capitalism

Since the understanding of culture in socialist Slovenia had not been connected with economic thinking, a long process of social transformation was necessary to cultivate this ideological position as normality. Institutional changes have played a major role in this process because the comprehension of culture among individuals and their behaviour, as well as the common perception of culture in society are shaped by the broader institutional framework⁸. Institutions regulate social relations that are part of society at the same time as they enable individuals to take part in social relations⁹. Thus, they establish the society as a stable and total structure and "install" individuals as members of society. Under capitalism, institutions are an outcome of the struggle between social forces that privilege market expansion and the increasing commodification of social relations on the one hand and the social demands for political stabilization and a stable life-world on the other.¹⁰ This struggle is socially managed and coordinated by the institutional arrangements of the state.

života s druge strane¹⁰. Tu borbu društveno koordinira i njome upravlja državno institucionalno uređenje. Razmatranje kapitalizma kao institucionaliziranoga društvenog uređenja omogućuje nam fokus na mikro-dinamiku njegova uprizorenja i ponovnog uprizorenja u specifičnom kontekstu uspostavljenih ograničenja i mogućnosti. Slom socijalističke agende bio je dio procesa neoliberalne globalizacije koji je omogućio daljnju reprodukciju i širenje kapitalizma¹¹, a opravdavao se, i opravdava se u velikoj mjeri i danas, diskursom „globalizacije“, tj. rastućom neovisnošću i kompetitivnošću nacionalnih ekonomija¹². Ta se tzv. globalizacija često tumači kao nešto nametnuto, ireverzibilno i dominantno u odnosu na državu, zbog čega državi ne preostaje ništa drugo nego da se prilagodi vanjskim pritiscima¹³. Iako se karakter državne intervencije znatno promijenio, proces širenja kapitalističkih odnosa u razdoblju neoliberalne globalizacije u velikoj je mjeri ovisio o potezima pojedinih država i međunarodnih organizacija. Širenje mreža transnacionalne proizvodnje, rastuća važnost (ekonomskih) međunarodnih organizacija i međunarodni sporazumi stvaraju institucionalne uvjete za veću kapitalističku akumulaciju na globalnoj razini – no još ih je potrebno zakonski implementirati na nacionalnoj razini. Rasprave o ulozi države u suvremenom kapitalizmu taj proces često konceptualiziraju kao „internacionalizaciju države“¹⁴. Prema Panitchu, „kapitalistička

je globalizacija proces koji se također odvija unutar, kroz i pod egidom država; one ga kodiraju i u važnim aspektima čak i stvaraju“¹⁵. S obzirom na to da institucije istovremeno djeluju na općoj društvenoj razini i na individualnoj razini pojedinih članova društva, reforme koje su se odvijale u Sloveniji nakon ukidanja društvenog vlasništva i sustava samoupravljanja lokalne su društvene strukture u sve većoj mjeri prilagođavale društvenim strukturama „globalnog kapitalizma“¹⁶. Tako se lokalna kulturna proizvodnja danas sve više organizira u skladu s „kulturnom industrijom“. Do nedavno objavljenoga *Nacionalnog programa za kulturu* razvoj kapitalističkih odnosa u kulturi može se podijeliti na dva razdoblja. Tijekom devedesetih godina prošlog stoljeća glavni društveni rezultati institucionalnog preformiranja odnosili su se na uvođenje tržišno-poduzetničkog modela. Institucionalne promjene iz 2000-ih godina omogućile su postsocijalističkoj Sloveniji integraciju u globalno kapitalističko uređenje. U procesu kapitalističke restauracije slovenska (kapitalistička) država morala je izgraditi odgovarajuće institucionalno okruženje kako bi mogla istovremeno strukturirati odnos svojih državljana prema novoj stvarnosti i reproducirati državnu vlast. To je podrazumijevalo temeljite promjene u kulturnoj proizvodnji. Na razini društva trebalo je sferu kulture početi promatrati okom „ekonomike kulture“¹⁷, dok je na razini individualnih kulturnih proizvođača i publike bilo nužno

..... Considering capitalism as an institutionalized social order enables us to focus on the micro-dynamics of its enactment and re-enactment within a specific context of instituted constraints and opportunities. The fall of the socialist agenda was part of the process of neoliberal globalisation which enabled the further reproduction and expansion of capitalism¹¹. This process was and still is largely legitimized by the discourse of “globalization,” i.e. increasing interdependence and competitiveness of national economies¹². This so-called globalization is often interpreted as something imposed, irreversible and predominant in relation to the state and therefore the latter cannot do anything but to accommodate itself to external pressures.¹³ Although the nature of state intervention has changed considerably, the process of expansion of capitalist relations in the period of neoliberal globalisation has been highly dependent on the orchestrating actions of states and international organisations. The expansion of networks of transnational production, the increasing importance of (economic) international organizations, as well as international treaties, provide the institutional conditions for greater capitalist accumulation on the global level, but they still have to be legally implemented on the national level. The debates concerning the role of the state in contemporary capitalism often conceptualise this process as the “internationalisation of the state.”¹⁴ According

to Panitch, “capitalist globalisation is a process which also takes place in, through and under the aegis of states; it is encoded by them and in important respects even authored by them.”¹⁵ Since the institutions simultaneously operate on the general level of society and on the individual level of the members of society, the reforms taking place in Slovenia after the abolishment of the social ownership and self-management system have progressively accommodated local social structures to those of “global capitalism.”¹⁶ The implication of these reforms for the local cultural production is that it is now increasingly organized in line with the “cultural industry.” As it will be shown in what follows, up to the recent *National Culture Programme*, the development of capitalist relations in the field of culture could be divided in two periods. In the 1990s, the main social effects of the institutional reframing has been the introduction of the market entrepreneurial model, whereas in the 2000s, the institutional changes enabled post-socialist Slovenia to integrate into the global capitalist order. In the process of capitalist restoration, the Slovene (capitalist) state had to build a proper institutional environment to simultaneously structure the behaviour of its citizens to the new reality and to reproduce state power. This meant profound changes in the field of cultural production. On the level of society it was necessary to start perceiving the sphere of culture through the

prilagoditi njihov odnos prema takvom poimanju kulture. Da bi mogli uvesti kapitalističke odnose u kulturnu proizvodnju, kreatori kulturne politike morali su preorganizirati već postojeće (socijalističke) institucije i oblike javnog financiranja. Iz tog je razloga bilo nužno prilagoditi nacionalni zakonski okvir kulturnog sektora kojim se definiraju odnosi i statusi kulturnih subjekata.

Uspostavljanje tržišno-poduzetničkog modela

Način organiziranja kulturne proizvodnje bila je tema intenzivnih rasprava već tijekom socijalizma, posebno u drugoj polovici 1980-ih godina. Umjetnici koji su djelovali u području nezavisne kulture vodili su bitku s „buržuskim nacionalističkim političkim projektima“¹⁸ koje su proizvodile nacionalne kulturne institucije. Nastojali su u javni kulturni prostor uvesti subverzivne „estetske prakse“¹⁹ koje bi nadvladale elitni status nacionalne kulture. Kao nasljednici prijašnjih borbi za kulturnu revoluciju spomenuti su umjetnici slijedili princip prema kojem je nova umjetnost tražila temeljitu transformaciju kulturnih institucija. No za razliku od neinstitucionalne umjetničke zajednice iz 1960-ih godina koja je težila institucionalnoj primjeni novih estetskih praksi²⁰, neinstitucionalna umjetnička zajednica iz 1980-ih oblikovala je svoju vlastitu materijalnu radnu bazu na principu estetike *punka* i pristupa „uradi sam“ (DIY)²¹. To je rezultiralo tzv. mrežom alternativnih prostora kulturne proizvodnje koji su djelovali

usporedno s drugim kulturnim institucijama. Nakon pada socijalizma i raspada starih institucija i mreža nezavisne kulture ti su konflikti oko pitanja *estetskih praksi* preusmjereni u liberalne rasprave o *organizaciji* i *institucionalizaciji* kulturne proizvodnje. Breznik navodi da se: „[nezavisna kultura], kao oblik umjetničke revolucije bez društvene revolucije i domovine, povezala s međunarodnim umjetničkim sistemom i ostvarila podršku međunarodnih (nevladinih) organizacija koje su na taj način promovirale društvene reforme u postsocijalističkim državama. Početkom 1990-ih godina mnoštvo je takvih organizacija ‚nahrupilo‘ u Sloveniju te su, poput svojevrsnih pastora, nadzirale učinkovito upravljanje kulturnim organizacijama (kulturni menadžment), podržavale suvremenu umjetnost, poticale reforme javnog sustava i otvarale put globalnoj slobodnoj trgovini. [...] Upravo se među pristalicama nezavisne kulture mogu naći mnogi koji poduzetničku kulturu vide kao nadomjestak za nacionalnu kulturu.“²² U mnoštvu novih međunarodnih organizacija najupečatljiviji je bio projekt Georgea Sorosa *Open Society Institute*, osnovan 1992. godine u Sloveniji²³.

OPEN SOCIETY INSTITUTE OSTVARIO JE ZNAČAJNE MATERIJALNE UČINKE UVEŠTI U SLOVENSKU KULTURNU PROIZVODNJU SPECIFIČAN OBLIK FINANCIRANJA PUTEM JAVNIH NATJEČAJA.

THE OPEN SOCIETY INSTITUTE HAD SIGNIFICANT MATERIAL IMPLICATIONS AS IT INTRODUCED WITHIN SLOVENE CULTURAL PRODUCTION A PARTICULAR TYPE OF FUNDING ON THE BASIS OF TENDERS.

lens of the “economics of culture,”¹⁷ whereas on the level of individual cultural producers and the audience it was necessary to accommodate their behaviour to such an understanding of culture. To introduce capitalist relations in the field of cultural production, cultural policy-makers had to reorganise the pre-existing (socialist) cultural institutions and public funding. For this reason it was necessary to accommodate the national legal framework in cultural sector which defines relations and statuses of cultural subjects.

The establishment of the market entrepreneurial model

The organisation of cultural production was an object of intense debates already during socialism, particularly in the second part of 1980s. Artists active in the field of the independent culture were struggling against “bourgeois nationalist political projects”¹⁸ produced by national cultural institutions and were striving to introduce subversive “aesthetics practices”¹⁹ into public space that would overcome elite position of the national culture. As a successor of previous struggles for Cultural Revolution they followed the principle that the new art should demand a profound transformation of cultural institutions. But unlike the non-institutional art community of the 1960s that strived to apply new aesthetics practices in institutions²⁰, the non-institutional art community of the 1980s formed its own

material working basis on the principle of *punk aesthetics* and *DIY* approach²¹. This resulted in the so-called network of underground places that operated parallel with other cultural institutions. After the collapse of socialism and the dissolution of the old institutions and networks of independent culture these conflicts concerning *aesthetics practices* were channelled in liberal debates concerning the *organisation* and *institutionalisation* of cultural production. Breznik writes: “As an art revolution without a social revolution and without a homeland, it [independent culture] linked up to the international art system and gained support from international (non-governmental) organisations, which used it to promote social reforms in post-socialist states. At the beginning of the 1990s, quite a few such organisations rushed into Slovenia and, as pastors of some kind, they kept watch over the effective management of cultural organisations (cultural management), supported contemporary art, incited reforms of the public system, and paved the way for global free trade. [...] It is precisely among the adherents of independent culture that

Ta je organizacija svoje djelovanje započela kao krovna fundacija za financiranje projekata u kulturi, znanosti, društvenom aktivizmu itd. te je uvela neke sadržaje koji se nisu podudarali s ondašnjom dominantnom ideologijom²⁴. Važnije, *Open Society Institute* ostvario je značajne materijalne učinke uvevši u slovensku kulturnu proizvodnju specifičan oblik financiranja putem javnih natječaja. To je posljedično unaprijedilo razvoj kulturne proizvodnje na razini nevladinih institucija i pružilo važan ideološki doprinos liberalizaciji javnih sredstava. U općem ozračju ideoloških turbulencija toga vremena, usvajanje takvog tipa financiranja proizvodnje – što je kasnije potaknulo i normaliziralo proizvodnju projekata i programa zasnovanu na natječajima – prihvaćeno je bez mnogo kritike²⁵. Oblik financiranja koji se zasniva na natječajima ključan je korak u liberalizaciji slovenske kulturne proizvodnje i uspostavljanja kulturne industrije: takvim se načinom financiranja razvija tržišno natjecanje između kulturnih proizvođača koji ovise o uspješnom financiranju. Transformacije tog tipa ne bi bile moguće bez prethodnog usvajanja odgovarajućega zakonskog okvira. Izrada nacionalnoga institucionalnog okvira nije jednostrani rad vlade, nego složeni proces u kojem sudjeluju različite društvene skupine, poput predstavnika proizvođača, vlade ili poduzetnika. Javnu raspravu o budućem razvoju kulture od početka 1990-ih godina obilježio

je sukob između „konzervativaca“ i „reformista“ o tome u čiju bi korist javna kulturna politika trebala djelovati: nevladinih kulturnih inicijativa koje svoju aktivnost usmjeravaju u projekte ili postojećih javnih kulturnih ustanova²⁶. „Reformisti“ su zagovarali stratešku transformaciju kulturne politike, čime bi se redefinirala uloga kulture kao faktora (privrednog) napretka. „Konzervativci“ su se pak zalagali za „održanje *statusa quo*“, odnosno za to da javne ustanove i model javnog financiranja kulture ostanu onakvi kakvi su i bili²⁷. Taj je sukob mišljenja obilježio razvoj kulturne politike u Sloveniji tijekom 1990-ih godina te je naposljetku prevladao stav „reformista“, koji su dobili dodatnu podršku međunarodnih institucija. S obzirom na to da je nacionalna država integrirana u međunarodni poredak kroz razne međunarodne organizacije, nacionalne društvene dinamike međuovisne su s međunarodnim sporazumima i regulativama donesenima na svjetskoj ili lokalnoj razini. Regulative Europske

**U OPĆEM OZRAČJU IDEOLOŠKIH
TURBULENCIJA TOGA VREMENA,
USVAJANJE TAKVOG TIPA FINANCIRANJA
PROIZVODNJE – ŠTO JE KASNIJE
POTAKNULO I NORMALIZIRALO
PROIZVODNJU PROJEKATA I PROGRAMA
ZASNOVANU NA NATJEČAJIMA –
PRIHVAĆENO JE BEZ MNOGO KRITIKE.**

we find many of those who see entrepreneurial culture as a substitute for national culture.”²² The most visible among these new international organisations was the George Soros project *Open Society Institute*, established in 1992 in Slovenia²³. The organisation started operating as an umbrella foundation for funding productions in the fields of culture, science, social activism, etc. and it introduced some contents that did not tally with the dominant ideology of that time.²⁴ More importantly, the *Open Society Institute* had significant material implications as it introduced within Slovene cultural production a particular type of funding on the basis of tenders. Consequently it boosted the development of cultural production on the basis of non-government institutions and gave an important ideological input to the liberalisation of public assets. In the general climate of ideological turbulences at that time the acquisition of this type of production funding – that subsequently raised and normalised the tender-based project-program production – was accepted mostly without much criticism²⁵. The tender-based funding is a crucial step in the liberalization of Slovene cultural production and the establishment of cultural industry as it develops market competition among cultural producers that are dependent on successful funding. These transformations could not have been possible without a preliminary adoption of a proper legal framework. The formation of a national institutional

**IN THE GENERAL CLIMATE OF
IDEOLOGICAL TURBULENCES AT THAT
TIME THE ACQUISITION OF THIS TYPE
OF PRODUCTION FUNDING – THAT
SUBSEQUENTLY RAISED AND NORMALISED
THE TENDER-BASED PROJECT-PROGRAM
PRODUCTION – WAS ACCEPTED MOSTLY
WITHOUT MUCH CRITICISM.**

framework is not a one sided action of the government, but a rather complex process made by various social groups, such as representatives of direct producers or government or entrepreneurs. Since the beginning of the 1990s the public debate about the future development of culture was marked by the struggle between “conservatives” and “reformists” regarding on whose behalf public cultural policy should work: project-oriented, non-governmental cultural initiatives and activities, or existing public cultural institutions²⁶. The “reformists” favoured the strategic transformation of cultural policy, which would redefine the role of culture as a factor of (economic) progress, while “conservatives” were fighting to “keep the status quo”, i.e. that public institutions and public funding for culture remained unscathed²⁷. The struggle marked the development of cultural policy in Slovenia during the 1990s and ended with the prevalent position of “reformists” who got additional support from the

unije iznimno su važne što se tiče slovenske kulturne proizvodnje, jer je od kraja 1980-ih sudjelovanje Slovenije u modelu europskih integracija bilo na samom vrhu slovenske političke agende²⁸. Unutar Europske unije specifični se međusklop kulture i politike počeo razvijati ranih 1990-ih godina kada je Sporazumom o Europskoj uniji (iz 1992. godine) „kultura“ prepoznata kao važan segment u stvaranju europske politike. Pokretanjem agende za tzv. „kulturno djelovanje“²⁹ inicijative kulturne politike Europske unije počele su se koristiti kulturnim diskursom kao medijem u upravljanju europskim integracijama³⁰. U nastojanju da poveća mogućnosti Slovenije da u budućnosti postane članica Europske unije, slovensko Ministarstvo kulture tražilo je „novi model kulturne politike“³¹ koji bi pratio europske regulative i bio s njima u skladu³². Proces stvaranja prvog šireg propisa bio je vrlo dugotrajan: važan dokument *Zakon o ostvarivanju javnog interesa u kulturi* usvojen je tek krajem 1994. godine. Uspostava javnih i privatnih subjekata u kulturi bila je jedna od prvih i najvažnijih institucionalnih mjera koje su poduzete na dugom putu ka usvajanju ovog dokumenta. „To je postignuto tako što je država 1991. godine, prema Zakonu o društvenim ustanovama, preuzela upravljanje kulturnim ustanovama; na taj je način stvoren državni, odnosno javni sektor u kulturi.“³³ Slovenska država preuzela je odgovornost za gotovo 85 (nacionalnih) kulturnih ustanova (poput Opere,

Nacionalnog muzeja, Nacionalne knjižnice, Restauratorskog centra, Filmskog studija, raznih arhiva, profesionalnih kazališta, muzeja, instituta za zaštitu spomenika itd.), dok je ostale kulturne ustanove (javne knjižnice, lokalne kulturne centre i amaterske kulturne ustanove) iz prethodnog sustava prepustila financiranju na razini općina. Takvom institucionalnom reorganizacijom „kultura“ se transformirala iz „aktivnosti od posebnog društvenog značenja“³⁴ u oblik javne usluge. Isti je zakon omogućio stvaranje privatnoga kulturnog sektora, odnosno formiranje nevladinih (neprofitnih) ustanova ili udruženja koji su danas najčešći organizacijski oblik kulturne proizvodnje. Ako je nezavisna kultura 1980-ih godina bila organizirana kao mreža alternativnih prostora kulturne proizvodnje, novom je regulacijom njezina proizvodnja institucionalizirana i preorganizirana u model NGO proizvodnje koja slijedi poduzetničku logiku i etiku (kulturnog) menadžmenta³⁵. Restauracijom kapitalističkih vlasničkih odnosa i reorganizacijom javnog financiranja u kulturnom sektoru te su institucionalne reforme stvorile povoljne uvjete za integraciju kapitalističkih odnosa u slovenskoj kulturnoj proizvodnji. *Zakonom o ostvarivanju javnog interesa u kulturi* iz 1994. godine uveden je novi oblik javnog financiranja u kulturnom sektoru, koji je u regulaciju kulturnih aktivnosti unio načela natjecanja, selekcije i učinkovitosti. Usvajanjem tog zakona slovensko Ministarstvo kulture obvezalo se financirati kulturne ustanove prema načelima

international institutions. Since the national state is integrated in an international order through various international organisations, the national social dynamics are interdependent with international agreements and regulations made on the global or regional level. As far as the cultural production of Slovenia is concerned, the regulations of the European Union (EU) are of particular importance as the participation of the Slovene State in the European integration model was on the top of the political agenda since the end of the 1980s²⁸. Within the EU structures, a specific interface between culture and politics started in the early 1990s when the Treaty on the European Union (1992) recognized “culture” as an object of concern for European policy-making. Launching the agenda for the so-called “cultural action,”²⁹ the EU cultural policy initiatives started to use the cultural discourse as a medium for the management of European integration³⁰. To increase the possibilities of future EU membership, the Slovenian Ministry of culture was searching for “a new model of cultural policy”³¹ that would be more in accordance with European regulations³². The formation of the first broader regulation took a very long time and it was not before the end of 1994 that the major document *Exercising of the Public Interest in Culture Act* was adopted. The establishment of public and private subjects in culture was one of the first and most important

institutional measures on the long road towards the introduction of this document. “This was achieved by the state taking over cultural institutions in 1991 according to the Law on Social Institutions; and this is how the state, i.e. the public sector in culture was created.”³³ The Slovenian state overtook the responsibility for almost 85 (national) cultural institutions (The Opera, the National Museum, the National Library, Restoration Centre, Film Studio, various archives, professional theatres, museums, institutes for protection of monuments etc.), leaving other cultural institutions (public libraries, local cultural centres and amateur culture) from the former system to the municipalities funding. Together with this institutional reorganisation, the “culture” was transformed from an “activity of special social meaning”³⁴ into a public service. The very same law established the private cultural sector, i.e. the formation of non-governmental (non-profit) institutions or associations that nowadays represent the most frequent organisational form of cultural production. If the independent culture from the 1980s was organised as a network of underground places, the new regulation institutionalized and reorganised its production into NGO production that follows the entrepreneurial logic and (cultural) management ethics³⁵. By the restoration of capital property relations and the reorganization of public financing in the cultural sector, those institutional reforms provided favourable grounds for the integration of capitalist relations in the cultural production in Slovenia.

njihova učinka i na osnovi ugovora. Takav se oblik financiranja službeno naziva „programskim financiranjem“, no Vesna Čopič navodi da ga je prikladnije zvati „financiranje prema ciljevima“³⁶. Fondovi su oblikovani prema sustavu temeljenom na izvodivosti, pri čemu su kapaciteti kulturnog proizvođača za ispunjenje prioriteta kulturne politike odlučujući faktor. Kako bi dobili javna sredstva, kulturni proizvođači moraju se prilagoditi logici ekonomske racionalnosti i efikasnosti te svojim djelovanjem doprinijeti tzv. kulturnoj dobrobiti društva u cjelini³⁷. Posljedično su različiti neovisni kulturni proizvođači (nakon što su bili izgubili solidarne mreže koje su činile materijalnu bazu nezavisne kulture

AKO JE NEZAVISNA KULTURA 1980-IH GODINA BILA ORGANIZIRANA KAO MREŽA ALTERNATIVNIH PROSTORA KULTURNE PROIZVODNJE, NOVOM JE REGULACIJOM NJEZINA PROIZVODNJA INSTITUCIONALIZIRANA I PREORGANIZIRANA U MODEL NGO PROIZVODNJE KOJA SLIJEDI PODUZETNIČKU LOGIKU I ETIKU (KULTURNOG) MENADŽMENTA. RESTAURACIJOM KAPITALISTIČKIH VLASNIČKIH ODNOSA I REORGANIZACIJOM JAVNOG FINANCIRANJA U KULTURNOM SEKTORU TE SU INSTITUCIONALNE REFORME STVORILE POVOLJNE UVJETE ZA INTEGRACIJU KAPITALISTIČKIH ODNOSA U SLOVENSKOJ KULTURNOJ PROIZVODNJI.

IF THE INDEPENDENT CULTURE FROM THE 1980S WAS ORGANISED AS A NETWORK OF UNDERGROUND PLACES, THE NEW REGULATION INSTITUTIONALIZED AND REORGANISED ITS PRODUCTION INTO NGO PRODUCTION THAT FOLLOWS THE ENTREPRENEURIAL LOGIC AND (CULTURAL) MANAGEMENT ETHICS. BY THE RESTORATION OF CAPITAL PROPERTY RELATIONS AND THE REORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC FINANCING IN THE CULTURAL SECTOR, THOSE INSTITUTIONAL REFORMS PROVIDED FAVOURABLE GROUNDS FOR THE INTEGRATION OF CAPITALIST RELATIONS IN THE CULTURAL PRODUCTION IN SLOVENIA.

..... The *Exercising of the Public Interest in Culture Act* from the year 1994 introduced a new type of public funding in cultural sector that brought the principles of competition, selection and efficiency in the regulation of cultural activities. By putting the *Act* into power, the Ministry of Culture of Slovenia obliged itself to fund cultural institutions on the principles of their performance and on contract basis. This type of funding is formally named “program funding,” but as Vesna Čopič suggests, it is more proper to call it “financing by objectives,”³⁶ The funds are designed on a performance-based system, i.e. the capacities of a cultural producer to fulfil the priorities of the cultural policy are decisive. In order to receive public funds, cultural producers have to adapt themselves to the

u socijalizmu) bili u potpunosti izuzeti iz javnog financiranja te su se počeli natjecati za sredstva s drugim sudionicima javnih natječaja. Ona kulturna proizvodnja koja nije uspjela udovoljiti tim zahtjevima ili je imala drugačiji program od onog što zahtijevali financijeri uglavnom bi nestala s kulturne scene ili je njezino djelovanje bilo vrlo ograničeno³⁸. Uvođenje tržišno-poduzetničkog modela u kulturi, koji regulira proizvodnju i distribuciju kulturnih proizvoda, bila je ključna institucionalna promjena na putu prema liberalizaciji. „Proizvodnja i recepcija umjetnosti preoblikovana je u okvirima političke logike u kojoj su brojnost publike i marketinška statistika postale ključni faktor u osiguranju javnog financiranja.“³⁹ Međutim otpor prema daljnjem određivanju kulturne proizvodnje kapitalističkoj logici i dalje je bio prisutan. Umjetnička zajednica na nož bi dočekala svaku zakonsku intervenciju koja je mogla donijeti temeljitu promjenu u radnim odnosima, deregulaciju, denacionalizaciju ili privatizaciju koja bi ugrozila javni kulturni sektor. Time su rasprave o promjenama u domeni radnih odnosa i radu javnih kulturnih ustanova bile odgođene do prve prilagodbe Nacionalnog programa za kulturu 2004. godine⁴⁰. Snažan otpor umjetničke zajednice bio je prepreka daljnjim reformama prema liberalizaciji kulturnog sektora.

logic of economic rationality and efficiency and to contribute the so-called cultural “benefits” to the society as a whole³⁷. Consequently, various independent cultural producers, who had lost solidarity networks that were a material base for independent culture in the time of socialism were completely cut off from public finances and started to compete for funding with other tenders. Cultural production that was unable to meet these requirements or that had different intentions, mostly disappeared or its functioning was very limited³⁸. The introduction of the market entrepreneurial model in culture that regulates production and distribution of cultural outputs was a crucial institutional change towards liberalisation. “The production and reception of the arts was therefore reshaped within a political logic in which audience figures and marketing statistics became essential to securing public funding.”³⁹ Nevertheless, the resistance to further subordination of cultural production to capitalist logic still existed. Any legal intervention that could bring a fundamental change in labour relations, deregulation, de-étatisation or privatisation that would dissolve the public cultural sector was attacked by arts community. Thus, debates about changes in the field of labour relations and in the work of public cultural institutions were postponed until the adaptation of the National Cultural Program that for the first time occurred in 2004.⁴⁰ The strong resistance of art community was an obstacle for further reforms in the direction of liberalisation of cultural sector.

Agresivni liberalizam na lokalnoj i globalnoj razini

Stručnjaci koji su se zalagali za reforme tvrdili su da se zbog spomenutog otpora „razvoj kulturne politike u velikoj mjeri tijekom 1990-ih godina nije micao s mrtve točke“⁴⁴. Smatrali su da je početkom 2000-ih godina „postalo očito da održanje *statusa quo* ne može biti trajno rješenje“⁴². Njihov se argument pokazao kao samoispunjavajuće proročanstvo manifestirano kroz aktivnosti lokalnih i međunarodnih sila koje su podržavale daljnju liberalizaciju i privatizaciju u kulturi. *Opći sporazum o trgovini uslugama (General Agreement on Trade in Services – GATS)*⁴³ definira kulturu kao dio ekonomskog razvoja i uključuje sfere društvene proizvodnje koje su prethodno bile zaštićene od tržišta a tržišno orijentirane aktivnosti na globalnoj razini. Uz pomoć GATS-a *Svjetska trgovinska organizacija (WTO)* stekla je mogućnost oblikovati nacionalnu kulturnu politiku i posljedično utjecati na lokalnu kulturnu proizvodnju⁴⁴. Potpisivanjem tog sporazuma sve su se članice WTO-a obvezale postupno implementirati model progresivne liberalizacije trgovine uslugama i ukloniti nacionalne mjere koje su bile uvedene u svrhu osiguranja boljih uvjeta u trgovini roba i usluga za domaće tvrtke u odnosu na one inozemne⁴⁵. Iduća važna institucionalna promjena na putu prema kulturnoj industriji dogodila se 2002. godine, gotovo deset godina nakon prvog vala reformi, u obliku novog *Zakona o ostvarivanju javnog interesa*. Prvi koraci prema tom dokumentu

zapravo su bili poduzeti odmah nakon usvajanja starog Zakona. Uz podršku državnih aparata i međunarodnih institucija, lokalni zagovornici reformi pokrenuli su proces evaluacije nacionalne kulturne politike. Slovensko Ministarstvo kulture 1995. godine naručilo je interni izvještaj o nacionalnoj kulturnoj politici, nakon čega je uslijedio vanjski kontraizvještaj o slovenskoj kulturnoj politici koji je provelo Vijeće Europe⁴⁶. Rezultati obju evaluacija pokrenuli su veliku javnu raspravu; slovensko Ministarstvo kulture i Vijeće Europe organizirali su simpozij na kojem su se suprotstavila različita mišljenja. Zaključci završene javne rasprave trebali su kreatorima slovenske kulturne politike poslužiti kao referentni stručni izvor u pripremi budućega *Nacionalnog programa za kulturu*⁴⁷. Još važnije, argumenti stručnjaka koji su se zalagali za progresivnu liberalizaciju i privatizaciju u kulturnom sektoru, kao i za fleksibilizaciju radnih odnosa, također su utjecali na institucionalni nacionalni okvir. Institucionalna implementacija zahtjeva za reformama u kulturnoj djelatnosti usvojena je 2002. godine obnovom *Zakona o ostvarivanju javnog interesa u kulturi*. Novi, doradjeni Zakon potaknuo je dva daljnja vrlo važna procesa za našu temu: redefiniciju javnog interesa i transformaciju umjetnika ili kulturnog radnika u poduzetnika. Prema Breznik⁴⁸, Zakon iz 2002. godine pokrenuo je veliku transformaciju poimanja javnog interesa. Dok se Zakon iz 1994. godine više koncentrirao na „tehničku definiciju“ pojma javnog interesa s posebnim naglaskom

Offensive liberalism on local and global level

Experts who were in favour of reforms claimed that the “cultural policy development had largely been deadlocked during the 1990s” because of this resistance⁴¹. According to them, at the beginning of the new millennium “it became obvious that maintaining a status quo cannot be the permanent solution.”⁴² Rather than a sufficient argument this was a self-fulfilling prophecy that was realised through activities of local and international forces that supported further liberalisation and privatisation in culture. The *General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS)*⁴³ defines culture as a part of economic development and incorporates the fields of social production that were previously protected from the market into market oriented activities on the global level. With the enforcement of GATS, *World Trade Organisation (WTO)* has acquired the possibility to shape national cultural policy and to consequently influence the local cultural production⁴⁴. By signing this treaty, all WTO members pledged themselves to gradually implement the progressive liberalization of trade in services and to eliminate governmental measures that ensure better conditions for domestic companies compared to foreign ones in the trade of goods and services⁴⁵. The next major institutional change in the trajectory toward cultural industry

occurred almost ten years after the first wave of reforms and was formulated in the new *Exercising of the Public Interest in Culture Act* in 2002. First steps towards this document actually started directly after the old *Act* had been adopted. With the support of the state apparatuses and international institutions, local reformist proponents launched the evaluation of the national cultural policy. In the year 1995, the Slovenian Ministry of Culture commissioned an internal report on national cultural policy that was followed by an external contra report on Slovenian cultural policy on the behalf of the Council of Europe⁴⁶. The findings of both evaluations launched a big public discussion and confronted various opinions at the symposium organised by the Slovenian Ministry of Culture and the Council of Europe. The conclusions of this public discussion should have served to Slovenian cultural policy makers as a resource of expertise for the formation of the future *National Cultural Program*⁴⁷. More importantly, the experts’ arguments favouring progressive liberalisation and privatisation in cultural sector as well as flexibilisation of labour relations had an impact on the institutional national framework as well. The institutional implementation of the demands for reforms in cultural activities was adopted in the year 2002 when the *Exercising of the Public Interest in Culture Act* was renewed. The updated law triggered two further underlying processes of particular importance for our subject: the redefinition of the public interest

na „dostupnost kulturnih vrijednosti“, novi je Zakon iz 2002. godine javni interes definirao kao izniman državni interes. Ta definicija ima važnu ulogu u današnjem političkom opravdavanju pružanja javne financijske potpore razvoju kulturnih industrija, dok država osigurava „dostupnost kulturnih vrijednosti“ samo u slučajevima i područjima u kojima (kapitalističko) tržište ne pruža dovoljnu količinu ili kvalitetu specifičnih kulturnih dobara⁴⁹. Izmjenom modela javnog financiranja u pomoćni mehanizam koji bi trebao održavati „pravednost tržišne ekonomije“⁵⁰ i pridonijeti razvoju kulturne industrije, Zakon iz 2002. godine osnažio je tržišno-poduzetnički model u kulturi. Uz liberalizaciju i privatizaciju kulturnih djelatnosti, novom je zakonskom regulacijom iz 2002. godine uveden i novi režim radnih odnosa. Tako su „nezavisni kulturni radnici“, kako ih je definirao Zakon o kulturnim radnicima iz 1982. godine, 2002. godine dobili status „samozaposlenih u kulturi“⁵¹. Za razliku od redovno zaposlenih radnika u (javnim) kulturnim institucijama, status samozaposlenih u kulturi zakonski je priznat kao oblik poduzetništva, a njihov rad kao oblik usluge⁵². Glavni problem kod statusa samozaposlenih u kulturi leži u činjenici što takve osobe nemaju nikakva radnička prava, iako su zapravo u nadničkom odnosu. Dodatni je problem, uz model državnog „financiranja prema ciljevima“, rastuća napetost konkurencije između kulturnih radnika i transformacija domene kulturne

proizvodnje u aglomerat izoliranih i međusobno konkurentnih pojedinaca⁵³. Takve okolnosti sprječavaju formiranje organiziranoga zajedničkog otpora kulturnih proizvođača. Kao primjer možemo navesti osvrt jednog radnika u području suvremenog plesa: „Današnji je stvaralački prostor ograničen i podijeljen na dva dijela; konkurentnost sve više poprima obilježja klasne borbe protiv onih koji „uživaju“ pogodnost ministarskog ili općinskog programskog financiranja, iako je riječ o lažnoj borbi, dok je područje suvremenog plesa postalo potpuno nestabilno područje rada u kojem jedna politička odluka može izbrisati tri godine profesionalnog rada.“⁵⁴

**GLAVNI PROBLEM KOD STATUSA
SAMOZAPOSLjenih U KULTURI LEŽI U ČINJENICI
ŠTO TAKVE OSOBE NEMAJU NIKAKVA RADNIČKA
PRAVA, IAKO SU ZAPRAVO U NADNIČKOM
ODNOSU. DODATNI JE PROBLEM, RASTUĆA
NAPETOST KONKURENCIJE IZMEĐU KULTURNIH
RADNIKA I TRANSFORMACIJA DOMENE
KULTURNE PROIZVODNJE U AGLOMERAT
IZOLIRANIH I MEĐUSOBNO KONKURENTNIH
POJEDINACA.**

and the transformation of the artist or cultural worker into an entrepreneur. According to Breznik⁴⁸, the 2002 Act entailed a major transformation in the understanding of the public interest. If the 1994 Act contained a more “technical definition” of public interest with a special emphasis on the “accessibility of cultural values,” the Act from the year 2002 defined public interest as an exclusive interest of the state. This redefinition plays an important role in today’s political justifying of public financial support for the development of cultural industries while the state assures the “accessibility of cultural values” only in the case and in the fields where the (capitalist) market is not providing the sufficient extent or sufficient quality of particular cultural assets⁴⁹. By changing the public financing into supporting mechanism that should sustain the “fairness of the market economy”⁵⁰ and develop cultural industry, the Act from 2002 reinforced the market entrepreneurial model in culture. Besides the liberalisation and privatisation of cultural activities, the 2002 regulation imposes a new regime in employment relations. The “independent cultural workers,” defined by the *Law on cultural workers* from the year 1982, have been given the status of “self-employed in culture” in 2002.⁵¹ Unlike workers who are regularly employed in the (public) cultural institutions, the self-employed individuals are legally recognised as an enterprise and their work is seen as a service.⁵² The main problem with the self-employed status is that it is not entitling

**THE MAIN PROBLEM WITH THE SELF-EMPLOYED
STATUS IS THAT IT IS NOT ENTITLING TO ANY
WORKERS’ RIGHTS, ALTHOUGH IT IS IN FACT A
WAGE RELATION. THE SECOND PROBLEM WITH
THIS STATUS, IS THE INCREASING TENSION OF
COMPETITION AMONG CULTURAL WORKERS
AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE FIELD OF
CULTURAL PRODUCTION INTO AN AGGLOMERATE
OF ISOLATED AND MUTUALLY COMPETING
INDIVIDUALS.**

to any workers’ rights, although it is in fact a wage relation. The second problem with this status, combined with the state’s “financing by objectives,” is the increasing tension of competition among cultural workers and the transformation of the field of cultural production into an agglomerate of isolated and mutually competing individuals⁵³. This situation is preventing organised common resistance of cultural producers. As it was expressed in the field of contemporary dance: “Presently, the space is stifled and divided into two parts; competition increasingly appears as a class struggle against those who “enjoy” programme financing from the Ministry or municipalities, albeit this is a false struggle, while contemporary dance as a field is totally unstable, where one political decree can erase three years of professional work.”⁵⁴

Put prema kulturnoj industriji

Sve jača integracija kapitalističkih odnosa u kulturnoj proizvodnji, vođena slovenskom državnom kulturnom politikom, rezultirala je činjenicom da su danas i sami kulturni radnici prihvatili jednosmjerni put prema kulturnoj industriji. Prethodni su zakoni (iz 1994. i 2002. godine) pripremili zakonsku osnovu za razvijene i društveno integrirane tržišne odnose, dok je *Nacionalnim programom za kulturu* iz 2014. godine predviđena daljnja liberalizacija javnih kulturnih ustanova.⁵⁵ Razvojem modela javnog upravljanja u javnim ustanovama i jačanjem javno-privatnog vlasništva, slovenska država ima ulogu investitora koji, umjesto raspodjele javnih sredstava, radije ta sredstva troši u određene svrhe. Sve te mjere dodatno pomažu reorganizaciji kulturne proizvodnje u kulturnu industriju. Transformacijom javne uprave u oblik javnog menadžiranja javne kulturne ustanove također mijenjaju svoj karakter. Umjesto da se brinu o specifičnim društvenim potrebama slovenskog stanovništva, preuzimaju tržišno-poduzetnički model i svoje djelovanje usmjeravaju prema lukrativnim ciljevima. Ulaskom u utrku za subvencije i potrošače s drugim (privatnim ili javnim) ustanovama mijenjaju uvjete preživljavanja na tržištu i posljedično eliminiraju one koji ne mogu „pratiti igru“. Javno-privatno partnerstvo omogućava usmjeravanje javnih sredstava u privatni sektor i ubrzava

reorganizaciju nekoć pretežno obrtničke proizvodnje kulture u proizvodnju organiziranu kao kulturnu industriju. S obzirom na to da je *Nacionalnim programom za kulturu 2014. – 2017.* razvoj kulturnih industrija definiran kao javni interes, privatni primatelji sredstava moraju svoje ciljeve reorganizirati i definirati u skladu s *Programom* kako bi mogli dobiti javna sredstva. Novim je režimom tako ojačana nadzornička uloga države u regulaciji kulturne proizvodnje, što je bilo u kontrastu s očekivanjima kulturnih radnika. Osvrćući se na proces institucionalizacije plesne produkcije u Sloveniji, Mateja Bučar na forumu *Maska* navela je sljedeće: „Kulturna bi politika trebala i morala osmisliti mehanizam koji bi ulaganjem u samog umjetnika omogućio razvoj plesnog stvaralaštva. [...] No naša politika zapravo želi biti *producer*, a ne tek puki sufinancijer; natječajima nastoji oblikovati kulturne programe. Time se ukida i preskače bit umjetnikovog rada, jer državna kulturna politika nema povjerenja u umjetnikov rad niti u njega ulaže.“⁵⁶

**TRANSFORMACIJOM JAVNE UPRAVE U OBLIK
JAVNOG MENADŽERIRANJA JAVNE KULTURNE
USTANOVE TAKOĐER MIJENJAJU SVOJ KARAKTER.
UMJESTO DA SE BRINU O SPECIFIČNIM DRUŠTVENIM
POTREBAMA SLOVENSKEG STANOVNIŠTVA,
PREUZIMAJU TRŽIŠNO-PODUZETNIČKI MODEL
I SVOJE DJELOVANJE USMJERAVAJU PREMA
LUKRATIVNIM CILJEVIMA.**

**BY TRANSFORMING PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
INTO PUBLIC MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC CULTURAL
INSTITUTIONS ARE CHANGING THEIR CHARACTER.
INSTEAD OF SATISFYING THE PARTICULAR SOCIAL
NEEDS OF THE POPULATION, THEY ARE OVERTAKING
A MARKET ENTREPRENEURIAL MODEL AND CHASE
LUCRATIVE GOALS.**

Toward cultural industry

The progressive integration of capitalist relations in the field of cultural production led by the cultural policy of the Slovenian state results in the today's acceptance of a one-way road towards cultural industry by cultural workers themselves. While the previous (1994 and 2002) Acts prepared a legal ground for developed and socially integrated market relations, the future regulatory regime set in the *National Cultural Program* of 2014 is supposed to further liberalise public cultural institutions⁵⁵. With the development of public management in public institutions and the reinforcement of public-private partnerships the Slovene state is playing the role of an investor that, rather than distributing public funds, is spending public funds in order to reach certain objectives. All these measures are supporting the reorganisation of cultural production towards cultural industry. By transforming public administration into public management, public cultural institutions are changing their character. Instead of satisfying the particular social needs of the population, they are overtaking a market entrepreneurial model and chase lucrative goals. By entering the competition with other (private or public) institutions for subsidies and for consumers they change the conditions for surviving on the market and consequently eliminate those who cannot stay in "the game." The private-public partnership enables the channelization of public funds into the private sector

and accelerates the reorganisation of predominantly artisan's cultural production into cultural industry production. Since the *National Cultural Program 2014-2017* defined development of cultural industries as a public interest, the private receivers must reorganise and define their goals in accordance with it in order to receive public funds. The new regime empowers the supervisory role of the state in the regulation of cultural production what was already now in opposition to the expectation of cultural workers. Commenting on the institutionalisation of dance production in Slovenia, Mateja Bučar exposed on the *Maska forum*: "Cultural politics could and should come up with a mechanism that would enable the development of dance field through investing in the artist. [...] But our politics actually wants to be a *producer*, not merely a co-financer; it tries to shape the programmes with the tenders. The essence of the artist's work is thus cancelled, skipped, and because they have no confidence in it, there are no investments in it."⁵⁶

Zaključak

Institucionalna promjena u kulturnoj proizvodnji bitno je odredila odnos između umjetničke zajednice i države. Imitiranjem odnosa tržišne ekonomije mehanizmi javne potpore stubokom su promijenili način na koji funkcioniraju. Prema istraživanju Maje Breznik provedenom iz pozicije kulturnih radnika, postupno nestaju razlike između uloge države, privatnih donatora i kapitala. Posljedično, oni svoje odnose s državnim ili lokalnom vlasti spontano percipiraju kao tržišne odnose⁵⁷. Zbog međusobne konkurencije, kulturni proizvođači moraju intenzivirati svoje kulturne aktivnosti i učinke prema onima koji ostvaruju komercijalni uspjeh. To je zauzvrat povezano s postupnom homogenizacijom proizvoda, što znači da pomalo nestaju razlike u estetskoj i konceptualnoj orijentaciji, umjetničkim ideologijama i praksama. Neovisno o tome o kakvim je umjetničkim programima ili misijama riječ, svi su kulturni proizvođači sve više prisiljeni svoje umjetničke prakse prvo prilagoditi umjetničkom ili kulturnom tržištu⁵⁸. Ta uniformnost dovodi do instrumentalizacije kreativnosti i komodifikacije kulturnih dobara⁵⁹. U takvim se okolnostima adekvatan emancipacijski politički ili društveni angažman kulturnih proizvođača ne smije zadržati na razini kritičke artikulacije društvenih problema. Nije dovoljno samo estetizirati probleme, nužno

je također problematizirati postojeću estetiku koja je rezultat podređivanja kulture kapitalističkoj proizvodnji⁶⁰. Kao što se kapitalistički karakter nekog proizvoda razvija iz njegove *forme*, a ne *sadržaja* (odnosno iz načina na koji je proizveden), tako i otpor kapitalizmu nije samo obilježen *onime* protiv čega je otpor usmjeren, nego i *načinom na koji* se oblikuje. Osnovna je svrha kapitalističke proizvodnje ostvarivanje profita, a njezin indirektan učinak robni oblik kao opći oblik društvenog proizvoda. Zbog toga se proizvodnju društvenosti ne smije brkati s proizvodnjom društvenih događanja koji se bave protudruštvenim učincima kapitalističke proizvodnje. Umjesto toga, otpor umjetničke zajednice mora prisiliti kulturnu politiku da antagonizira ovu institucionalnu promjenu i preusmjeri svoju potporu prema onim društvenim praksama koje bitno dekomodificiraju proizvode.

**NIJE DOVOLJNO SAMO
ESTETIZIRATI PROBLEME, NUŽNO
JE TAKOĐER PROBLEMATIZIRATI
POSTOJEĆU ESTETIKU KOJA JE
REZULTAT PODREĐIVANJA KULTURE
KAPITALISTIČKOJ PROIZVODNJI.**

Conclusion

The institutional change in cultural production fundamentally marked the relationship between the art community and the state. By imitating market economy relations, public support mechanisms profoundly changed their mode of functioning. Following Maja Breznik's research from the point of view of cultural workers, the differences between the role of the state, private donors and capital fade out. As a consequence, they spontaneously perceive their relations to the state or local authorities as market relations.⁵⁷ Mutual competitiveness among cultural producers demands from them to intensify their cultural activities and benefits to those who are commercially successful. This, in turn, is associated with a gradual homogenisation of products, meaning that the differences concerning aesthetic and conceptual orientation, artistic ideologies and practices fade out. Regardless of what their artistic programmes or missions may be, all cultural producers are more and more obliged to corkscrew their artistic practices through the art or cultural market first⁵⁸. This uniformity brings both, the instrumentalization of creativity and the commodification of cultural goods⁵⁹. In this situation the adequate emancipatory political or social engagement of cultural producers must not stay on the level of critical articulation of social problems. It is not enough to aestheticise

the problems, it is also necessary to problematize the existing aesthetics that are a result of the subordination of art and culture to the capitalist production.⁶⁰ Just as the capitalist character of a product does not originate in its *content*, but rather in its *form* – that is, how the products were made – so is the resistance to capitalism marked not only by *what* this resistance states, but also by *how* it is formed. The basic purpose of capitalist production is to make profit, while its indirect effect is the commodity as a general form of social product. This is why the production of sociality must not be confused with the production of social events, which deal with antisocial effects of capitalist production; rather, the resistance of art community has to force the cultural policy to antagonise this institutional change and direct its support towards those social practices that essentially decommodify products.

¹ „Najprepoznatljivija je karakteristika stroja to što su njegovi dijelovi međusobno povezani i vođeni tako da je njihovo međuovisno gibanje ograničeno. U odnosu na blok, gibanje klipa klipnog motora ograničeno je cilindrom koji ga usmjerava po ravnoj putanji; točke na radilici ograničene su glavnim ležajevima, čime se usmjerava kružno gibanje; nijedan drugi oblik relativnog gibanja nije moguć.“ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, ključna riječ *Constrained motion*: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/134384/constrained-motion>

² Želim zahvaliti kolektivu BLOK na pozivu da napišem ovaj članak i anonimnim recenzentima na njihovim korisnim komentarima. Posebno sam zahvalna Ani Podvršič i Gottfriedu Krienzeru na čitanju nekoliko skica ovog članka i vrijednim sugestijama koje su mi uputili.

³ Kao što Claire Bishop navodi: „Početak rasta vidljivosti ovih [društveno angažiranih umjetničkih] praksi može se vremenski smjestiti u rane devedesete godine 20. st., kada je padom komunističkog režima politička ljevica lišena posljednjih ostataka revolucije koja je nekoć povezivala politički i estetski radikalizam.“ Claire Bishop: „The Social Turn: Collaboration and Its Discontents“, u: Margriet Schavemaker i Mischa Rakier (ur.), *Right About Now: Art and Theory Since the 1990s*, Valiz, Amsterdam, 2007., 59. Više o ovoj temi: Bojana Kunst, *Artist at Work, Proximity of Art and Capitalism*, Zero Book, John Hunt Publishing, Winchester, UK / Washington, USA, 2015.; Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*, Verso Books, London/NY, 2012.; Aldo Milohnić (ur.), *Gledalište upora, Dialogi*, 51, str. 1-2, 2015., Založba Aristej, Maribor.

⁴ U komentarima i osvrtima koje je Maja Breznik sabrala i uredila u knjizi *Posebni skepticizam v umetnosti* različiti autori posebnu pažnju pridaju „pitanju političkog teatra“ ili „političkim učincima vizualne umjetnosti“ u današnjem kapitalizmu. Maja Breznik, *Posebni skepticizam v umetnosti*, Založba Sophia, Ljubljana, 2011.

⁵ Za više detalja vidi zbirku tekstova i dokumenata iz navedenog razdoblja: Neža Malečkar, Tomaž Mastnak (ur.), *Punk pod Slovenci*, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, Republiška konferenca ZSMS, KRT, Ljubljana, 1985.; također vidi Aldo Milohnić, Ivo Svetina (ur.), *Prišli so Pupilčki: 40 let Gledališča Pupilje Ferkeverk*, Maska, Slovenski gledališki muzej, Ljubljana, 2009.

⁶ „Nacionalni program za kulturu postavlja osnovu kulturne politike i određuje područja djelovanja u kulturi koja se financiraju ili sufinanciraju iz državnog proračuna i drugih javnih i privatnih izvora.“ – članak 7. stavak 1. *Zakona o ostvarivanju javnog interesa u kulturi*, dostupnoga na internetskoj stranici: Uradni list RS http://www.uradni-list.si/1/objava.jsp_sop=2002-01-4807 (posljednji uvid 5. studenoga 2015.).

⁷ *Nacionalni program za kulturu 2014. – 2017.*, dostupan na internetskoj stranici: Ministarstvo za kulturu RS <http://www.mk.gov.si/fileadmin/mk.gov.si/pageuploads/Ministarstvo/Drugo/novice/NET.NPK.pdf> (posljednji uvid 5. studenoga 2015.).

⁸ Wolfgang Streeck na početku svoje knjige *Re-Forming Capitalism: Institutional Change in the German Political Economy* tvrdi da „se institucije političke ekonomije ne mogu promatrati pojedinačno, izolirane jedna od druge, nego kao elementi većega društvenog sustava kojemu pripadaju – koji osim toga mora biti koncipiran ne kao statična struktura, nego kao dinamičan proces. To podrazumijeva da se institucionalnu promjenu [...] ne bi trebalo promatrati kao samostalni subjekt, nego kao sastavni dio bilo kojeg društvenog ustroja, pri čemu svi oblici društvenih sustava moraju biti koncipirani na način kojim se izbjegava stvaranje privida statične ravnoteže kao empirijskog ili idealnog stanja“. Wolfgang Streeck, *Re-Forming Capitalism: Institutional Change in the German Political Economy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford i NY, 2009., str. 1.

⁹ Rastko Močnik, *3 teorije*, Založba Cj*, Ljubljana, 1999., str. 118.

¹⁰ Wolfgang Streeck, *Re-Forming Capitalism: Institutional Change in the German Political Economy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford i NY, 2009.

¹¹ Leo Panitch, Sam Gindin, *The Making of Global Capitalism*, Verso, London/New York, 2012.; Simon Clarke, „The Global Accumulation of Capital and the Periodisation of the State Form“, u: Werner Bonefeld i dr. (ur.), *Open Marxism. Vol. I*, Pluto Press, London, 1992.; David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.

¹² Diskurs globalizacije bio je dio rasprava o novom modelu kulturne politike 1994. godine, kao i rasprava vođenih 2014. godine. Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc (ur.), *Kulturna politika v Sloveniji*, Simpozij Fakulteta za družbene vede, Ljubljana, 1998.; *Nacionalni program za kulturu 2014. – 2017.*, dostupan na internetskoj stranici: Ministarstvo za kulturu RS <http://www.mk.gov.si/fileadmin/mk.gov.si/pageuploads/Ministarstvo/Drugo/novice/NET.NPK.pdf> (posljednji uvid 5. studenoga 2015.).

¹ “The most distinctive characteristic of a machine is that the parts are interconnected and guided in such a way that their motions relative to one another are constrained. Relative to the block, for example, the piston of a reciprocating engine is constrained by the cylinder to move on a straight path; points on the crankshaft are constrained by the main bearings to move on circular paths; no other forms of relative motion are possible.” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, keyword “Constrained motion”, <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/134384/constrained-motion>

² I would like to thank collective [BLOK] for inviting me to write this article as well as to the both anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. I am particularly indebted to Ana Podvršič and Gottfried Krienzer for reading several previous drafts of this paper and giving valuable suggestions.

³ As Claire Bishop said: “It is tempting to date the rise in visibility of these [socially engaged Art] practices to the early 1990s, when the fall of Communism deprived the Left of the last vestiges of the revolution that had once linked political and aesthetic radicalism.” Claire Bishop: “The Social Turn: Collaboration and Its Discontents”, in Margriet Schavemaker and Mischa Rakier (ed.), *Right About Now: Art and Theory Since the 1990s*, Valiz, Amsterdam, 2007, 59. More on this theme: Bojana Kunst, *Artist at Work, Proximity of Art and Capitalism*, Zero Book, John Hunt Publishing, Winchester, UK / Washington, USA, 2015; Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*, Verso Books, London/NY, 2012.; Aldo Milohnić (ed.), *Gledališče upora, Dialogi*, 51, 1-2, 2015, Založba Aristej, Maribor.

⁴ In the commentaries and reports, arranged and edited by Maja Breznik in the book *Posebni skepticizam v umetnosti (Particular Scepticism in Art)* various authors are putting special attention to “the question of political theatre” or “political effects of visual art” in today’s capitalism. Maja Breznik, *Posebni skepticizam v umetnosti* Založba Sophia, Ljubljana, 2011.

⁵ For details, see the collection of texts and documents from the period: Neža Malečkar, Tomaž Mastnak (ed.), *Punk pod Slovenci*, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, Republiška konferenca ZSMS, KRT, Ljubljana, 1985; see also Aldo

Milohnić, Ivo Svetina (ed.), *Prišli so Pupilčki: 40 let Gledališča Pupilje Ferkeverk*, Maska, Slovenski gledališki muzej, Ljubljana, 2009.

⁶ “The National Cultural Program sets down the foundation of cultural policy and determines the scope of activities in the field of culture that are financed or co-financed from the budget and other public and private sources” Article 7, paragraph 1, *Exercising of the Public Interest in Culture Act*, available online at: Uradni list RS http://www.uradni-list.si/1/objava.jsp_sop=2002-01-4807

⁷ *The National Culture Programme 2014–2017*, available online at: Ministrstvo za kulturo RS <http://www.mk.gov.si/fileadmin/mk.gov.si/pageuploads/Ministrstvo/Drugo/novice/NET.NPK.pdf> (last accessed 5 November 2015).

⁸ At the beginning of his book *Re-Forming Capitalism: Institutional Change in the German Political Economy* Wolfgang Streeck is arguing: “that the institutions of a political economy cannot really be understood one by one, in isolation from one another, but only as elements of the larger social system to which they belong—which in addition must be conceived not as a static structure, but as a dynamic process. This implies that institutional change, [...] should be regarded not as a subject of its own, but as a constitutive feature of any social formation, which requires social systems of all sorts to be conceived in a way that avoids creating the illusion of static equilibrium as an empirical or ideal condition”. Wolfgang Streeck, *Re-Forming Capitalism: Institutional Change in the German Political Economy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and NY 2009, 1.

⁹ Rastko Močnik, *3 teorije*, Založba Cj*, Ljubljana, 1999, 118.

¹⁰ Wolfgang Streeck, *Re-Forming Capitalism: Institutional Change in the German Political Economy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford and NY, 2009.

¹¹ Leo Panitch, Sam Gindin, *The Making of Global Capitalism*, Verso, London/New York, 2012; Simon Clarke, “The Global Accumulation of Capital and the Periodisation of the State Form”, in: Werner Bonefeld et al. (ed.), *Open Marxism. Vol. I*, Pluto Press, London, 1992; David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.

¹² The discourse of globalisation was incorporated in the debates about new model of cultural policy from 1995 as well as in the debates from 2014. Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc (ed.), *Kulturna politika v Sloveniji, Simpozij*, Fakulteta za družbene vede, Ljubljana, 1998; *The National Culture Programme 2014–2017*, available online at:

¹³ Za kritički osvrt na ovaj diskurs vidi: Neil Brenner, „Beyond state-centrism? Space, territoriality, and geographical scale in globalization studies“, u: *Theory and Society*, 28., 1999., str. 39-78.

¹⁴ Nikos Poulantzas, „Internationalization of Capitalist Relations and the Nation-State“, u: James Martin (ur.), *The Poulantzas Reader*, Verso, London/NY, 2008., str. 220-258.

¹⁵ Leo Panitch, „Globalization and the State“, u: *Socialist Register 1994: Between and Nationalism*, 1994., str. 69-72. Mišljenja o tome što „internacionalizacija države“ doista znači još nisu usuglašena. Po mišljenju autora koji svoj rad baziraju na djelu Roberta W. Coxa, neoliberalni kapitalizam transformirao je ulogu države koja sada služi kao svojevrsan „medijator“ između prioriteta vanjsko uspostavljene politike i unutarnjih društvenih sila prema kojima također ostaje odgovorna. Oспорavajući ovo gledište i polazeći od Poulantzasove teorije, Panitch ističe aktivno sudjelovanje svake kapitalističke države u današnjem procesu globalizacije. Više o ovoj raspravi: Robert W. Cox, „Global Perestroika“, u: Ralph Miliband, Leo Panitch (ur.), *Socialist Register 1992.*, Merlin, London, 1992.; Robert W. Cox, „Social Forces, States and the World Orders“, u: Robert O. Keohane (ur.), *Neo-Realism and its Critics*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1986.; Leo Panitch, Sam Gindin, *The Making of Global Capitalism*, Verso, London/New York, 2012.

¹⁶ Leo Panitch, Sam Gindin: *The Making of Global Capitalism*, Verso, London/New York, 2012.

¹⁷ Više o ovoj posebnoj ekonomskoj grani: Andrej Srakar, „Kulturna ekonomika in vrednotenje kulturnih dogodkov“, u: *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo*, 38., 241., 2010., Študentska založba, Ljubljana, str. 124-137.

¹⁸ Maja Breznik, „Kranjsko reprezentativno gledališče“, u: Maja Breznik (ur.), *Posebni skepticizem v umetnosti*, Založba Sophia, Ljubljana, 2011., str. 55.

¹⁹ Za daljnje teoretiziranje o estetskoj praksi vidi: Rastko Močnik, „Teorija umetnostnih praks“, u: *Veselje v gledanju*, Založba Cf*, Ljubljana, 2007., str. 49-82.

²⁰ Aldo Milohnić, Ivo Svetina (ur.), *Prišli so Pupilčki: 40 let Gledališča Pupilje Ferkeverk*, Maska, Slovenski gledališki muzej, Ljubljana, 2009.

²¹ Neža Malečkar, Tomaž Mastnak (ur.), *Punk pod Slovenci*, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, Republiška konferenca ZSMS, KRT, Ljubljana, 1985.

²² Maja Breznik, „Kranjsko reprezentativno gledališče“, u: Maja Breznik (ur.), *Posebni skepticizem v umetnosti*, Založba Sophia, Ljubljana, 2011., str. 56.

²³ Za više informacija o ideološkim pretpostavkama i materijalnim implikacijama projekta za stvaranje *otvorenog društva* vidi: Henriette Asséo, „Gypsy Studies in evropska manjinsko pravo“, u: *Časopis za kritiko znanosti*, XXXIX/247, 2012., Študentska založba, Ljubljana, str. 27-39. Martin Olivera također se osvrće na društveni i ekonomski kontekst uvođenja filantropskih organizacija u bivše socijalističke države, „Strokovno izdelovanje ‚romskega vprašanja‘ – prepletenost multikulturalizma in neoliberalizma“, *Časopis za kritiko znanosti*, XXXIX/247, 2012., Študentska založba, Ljubljana, str. 40-48.

²⁴ Iako se u današnje vrijeme srž društveno-političkih borbi pomaknula u smjeru obrane javnog sektora i javnih usluga od privatizacije i komercijalizacije, ne smijemo zaboraviti da je taj isti javni sektor tijekom 1990-ih godina imao odlučujući utjecaj na oblikovanje današnjeg društva; inertno je ispunjavao zahtjeve političkih elita i djelovao u skladu s nacionalističkom ideologijom.

²⁵ Eda Čufer, „Komentar“, u: Maja Breznik (ur.), *Posebni skepticizem v umetnosti*, Ljubljana, Založba Sophia, 2011., str. 33.

²⁶ Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc, „Threat or Opportunity? Slovenian Cultural Policy in Transition“, u: *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 30: 1, 2000., str. 51.

²⁷ Vesna Čopič, „Privatisation and culture: how to separate cultural policy from the provision of culture“, u: *Družboslovne razprave*, Vol. XV, 29., 1999., Slovensko sociološko društvo in Fakulteta za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, str. 166-186.

²⁸ Rastko Močnik, *Teorija za politiko*, Založba Cf*, Ljubljana, 2006., str. 7-15.

²⁹ Godine 1992. pod nazivom European Forum for the Arts and Heritage (EFAH) uspostavljeni su temelji za buduću platformu Culture Action Europe (CAE). Glavna je zadaća CAE-a aktivno raditi na europskoj kulturnoj politici i predstavljati kulturni sektor na europskoj razini.

³⁰ U članku *Culture, policy and subsidiarity in the European Union* Clive Barnett kritički se osvrće na diskurs inicijativa kulturne politike Europske unije 1990-ih godina. Clive Barnett, „Culture, policy and subsidiarity in the European Union: From symbolic identity to the governmentalisation of culture“, u: *Political Geography*, 20 (4), 2001., str. 405-426.

³¹ Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc, „Threat or Opportunity? Slovenian Cultural Policy in Transition“, u: *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 30: 1, 2000., str. 44.

Ministrstvo za kulturo RS <http://www.mk.gov.si/fileadmin/mk.gov.si/pageuploads/Ministrstvo/Drugo/novice/NET.NPK.pdf> (last accessed 5 November 2015).

¹³ For the critique of this discourse see: Neil Brenner, „Beyond state-centrism? Space, territoriality, and geographical scale in globalization studies“, in: *Theory and Society*, 28, 1999, 39-78.

¹⁴ Nikos Poulantzas, „Internationalization of Capitalist Relations and the Nation-State“, in: James Martin (ed.), *The Poulantzas Reader*, Verso, London/NY, 2008, 220-258.

¹⁵ Leo Panitch, „Globalisation and the State“, in: *Socialist Register 1994: Between Globalism and Nationalism*, 1994, 69-72. The agreement about what the „internationalisation of the state“ actually means has not yet been achieved. For authors based on the work of Robert W. Cox, the neoliberal capitalism transformed the role of the state which is now a sort of a ‘mediator’ between the externally established policy priorities and the internal social forces to which it also remains accountable. Contesting this view and working upon Poulantzas’ theory, Panitch emphasizes the active participation of each capitalist state in nowadays globalisation. More about this debates: Robert W. Cox, „Global Perestroika“, in: Ralph Miliband, Leo Panitch (ed.), *Socialist Register 1992*, Merlin, London, 1992; Robert W. Cox, „Social Forces, States and the World Orders“, in: Robert O. Keohane (ed.), *Neo-Realism and its Critics*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1986; Leo Panitch, Sam Gindin, *The Making of Global Capitalism*, Verso, London/New York, 2012.

¹⁶ Leo Panitch, Sam Gindin: *The Making of Global Capitalism*, Verso, London/New York, 2012.

¹⁷ More about this special economic branch: Andrej Srakar, „Kulturna ekonomika in vrednotenje kulturnih dogodkov“, in: *Časopis za kritiko znanosti, domišljijo in novo antropologijo*, 38, 241, 2010, Študentska založba, Ljubljana, 124-137.

¹⁸ Maja Breznik, „Kranjsko reprezentativno gledališče“, in: Maja Breznik (ed.), *Posebni skepticizem v umetnosti* Založba Sophia, Ljubljana, 2011, 55.

¹⁹ For a further theorization on aesthetics practice see: Rastko Močnik, „Teorija umetnostnih praks“, in: *Veselje v gledanju*, Založba Cf*, Ljubljana, 2007, 49-82.

²⁰ Aldo Milohnić, Ivo Svetina (ed.), *Prišli so Pupilčki: 40 let Gledališča Pupilje Ferkeverk*, Maska, Slovenski gledališki muzej, Ljubljana, 2009.

²¹ Neža Malečkar, Tomaž Mastnak (ed.), *Punk pod Slovenci*, Univerzitetna konferenca ZSMS, Republiška konferenca ZSMS, KRT, Ljubljana, 1985.

²² Maja Breznik, „Kranjsko reprezentativno gledališče“, in: Maja Breznik (ed.), *Posebni skepticizem v umetnosti* Založba Sophia, Ljubljana, 2011, 56.

²³ For more on the ideological assumptions and material implications of the project of creating an *open society*, see: Henriette Asséo, „Gypsy Studies in evropsko manjinsko pravo“, in: *Časopis za kritiko znanosti*, XXXIX/247, 2012, Študentska založba, Ljubljana, 27-39. The socio-economic context of introducing philanthropic organisations into former socialist states in Central and Easter Europe is also discussed by Martin Olivera, „Strokovno izdelovanje ‚romskega vprašanja‘ – prepletenost multikulturalizma in neoliberalizma“, *Časopis za kritiko znanosti*, XXXIX/247, 2012, Študentska založba, Ljubljana, 40-48.

²⁴ Although nowadays the centre of socio-political struggles has shifted towards defending the public sector and public services against privatisation and commercialisation; however, we should not forget that, back in the 1990s, this very same public sector exercised a decisive influence on the formation of the present society; it met the demands of political elites, and it did so by inertia; and it operated in compliance with nationalist ideology.

²⁵ Eda Čufer, „Komentar“, in: Maja Breznik (ed.), *Posebni skepticizem v umetnosti*, Ljubljana, Založba Sophia, 201, 33.

²⁶ Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc, „Threat or Opportunity? Slovenian Cultural Policy in Transition“, in: *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 30:1, 2000, 51.

²⁷ Vesna Čopič, „Privatisation and culture: how to separate cultural policy from the provision of culture“, in: *Družboslovne razprave*, Vol. XV, 29, 1999, Slovensko sociološko društvo in Fakulteta za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, 166-186.

²⁸ Rastko Močnik, *Teorija za politiko*, Založba Cf*, Ljubljana, 2006, 7-15.

²⁹ Under the name European Forum for the Arts and Heritage (EFAH) in the 1992 the bases for future platform Culture Action Europe (CAE) was set up. The main task of CAE is to work actively on European cultural policy and to represent the cultural sector at the European level.

³⁰ In the article *Culture, policy and subsidiarity in the European Union*, Clive Barnett critically assesses the discourse of cultural policy initiatives of the European Union

³² Kao što se slovenski ministar kulture tada pjesnički izrazio u svojem govoru na simpoziju o budućoj kulturnoj politici u Sloveniji: „važno je u isto vrijeme biti ovdje i ondje [...] u Sloveniji i u Europi“. Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc: *Kulturna politika v Sloveniji, Simpozij*, Fakulteta za družbene vede, Ljubljana, 1998., str. 13.

³³ Vesna Čopič, „Privatisation and culture: how to separate cultural policy from the provision of culture“, u: *Družboslovne razprave*, Vol. XV, 29., 1999., Slovensko sociološko društvo in Fakulteta za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, str. 171.

³⁴ *Zakon o kulturnoumetniških dejavnostih in o posredovanju kulturnih vrednot*, I. paragraf, Uradni list SRS br. 10/84.

³⁵ Za više informacija o procesu osnivanja nevladinih organizacija i njegovom doprinosu neoliberalne reorganizacije vidi: Tina Wallace, „NGO Dilemmas: Trojan Horses for Global Neoliberalism?“, *Socialist Register 2004: The New Imperial Challenge*, Vol. 40, 2004., str. 202-219.

³⁶ Vesna Čopič, „Privatisation and culture: how to separate cultural policy from the provision of culture“, u: *Družboslovne razprave*, Vol. XV, 29., 1999., Slovensko sociološko društvo Fakulteta za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, str. 174.

³⁷ Za kritički osvrt na evaluaciju društvenog utjecaja kulturne proizvodnje vidi: Paola Merli, (2002.) Evaluating the social impact of participation in arts activities, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8: 1, str. 107-118.

³⁸ Eda Čufer, „Komentar“, u: Maja Breznik (ur.), *Posebni skepticizam v umetnosti*, Ljubljana, Založba Sophia, 2011., str. 37.; Muršič, Rajko, Mladen Bačić [i dr.], *Na trdna tla*, Ustanova nevladinih mladinskega polja Pohorski bataljon (UPB), Tolmin, Koper, 2012.

³⁹ Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*, Verso Books, London/NY, 2012., str. 13.

⁴⁰ Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc, „Threat or Opportunity? Slovenian Cultural Policy in Transition“, u: *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 30: 1, 2000., str. 45.

⁴¹ *Isto*, str. 51.

⁴² Vesna Čopič, „Privatisation and culture: how to separate cultural policy from the provision of culture“, u: *Družboslovne razprave*, Vol. XV, 29., 1999., Slovensko sociološko društvo Fakulteta za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, str. 175.

⁴³ *Opći sporazum o carinama i trgovini (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade – GATT)* iz 1948. godine, koji je ojačao progresivnu liberalizaciju međunarodne robne trgovine, prethodnik je i model GATS-a. GATS je osmišljen zbog „rastuće važnosti trgovine uslugama u pogledu rasta i razvoja svjetske ekonomije“ te je njegov glavni cilj „brzo ostvariti progresivno više razine liberalizacije trgovine uslugama“. Sporazum priznaje državnu vlast kao „pravo članica da reguliraju i uvode nove regulacijske mjere u vezi s dobavom usluga unutar vlastitog teritorija“. Dostupno na internetskoj stranici: General Agreement on Trade in Services, WTO http://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/26-gats.pdf (posljednji uvid 5. studenoga 2015.).

⁴⁴ Maja Breznik u svojem članku *Culture between „l'exception culturelle“ and „cultural diversity“* ukazuje kako međunarodni sporazumi jačaju ekonomsku dimenziju kulture kao odlučujući faktor u formuliranju kulturne politike. Iako se na prvi pogled čini da međunarodne organizacije zastupaju lukrativne interese kulture ili globalne zabavljačke industrije dok država nastoji zaštititi lokalnu (nacionalnu) kulturnu proizvodnju, njihov odnos zapravo nije antagonistički nego komplementaran. Maja Breznik: „Culture between ‚l'exception culturelle‘ and ‚cultural diversity‘“, u: Aldo Milohnić i dr. (ur.): *Culture Ltd., Material Condition of Culture Production*, Peace Institute, Ljubljana, 2005., str. 15-43.

⁴⁵ Slovenija je postala članica *Svjetske trgovinske organizacije (WTO)* 30. srpnja 1995. godine potpisivanjem Marakeškog sporazuma i prihvaćanjem „Liste specifičnih obveza“. *Schedule of Specific Commitments*, GATS/SC/99, 03-2735, 30. kolovoza 1995., također objavljeno u Uradnom listu RS, 1995.

⁴⁶ Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc, *Kulturna politika v Sloveniji, Simpozij*, Fakulteta za družbene vede, Ljubljana, 1998.; Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc, „Threat or Opportunity? Slovenian Cultural Policy in Transition“, u: *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 30: 1, 2000., str. 46.

⁴⁷ Prvi nacrt ovog dokumenta priređen je 2000. godine, dok je prvi *Nacionalni program za kulturu* stupio na snagu 2004. godine.

⁴⁸ Maja Breznik, *Cultural Revisionism, Culture Between Neo-Liberalism and Social Responsibility*, Peace Institute, Ljubljana, 2004., str. 62.

⁴⁹ *Zakon o ostvarivanju javnog interesa u kulturi*, članak 25., Uradni list RS br. 96., 14. studenoga 2002., dostupno na internetskoj stranici: Pravno-informacijski servis RS <http://www.pisrs.si/Pis.web/pregledPredpisa?id=ZAKO381> (posljednji uvid 13. studenoga 2015.).

(EU) during the 1990s. Clive Barnett, „Culture, policy and subsidiarity in the European Union: From symbolic identity to the governmentalisation of culture“, in: *Political Geography*, 20(4), 2001, 405–426.

³¹ Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc, „Threat or Opportunity? Slovenian Cultural Policy in Transition“, in: *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 30:1, 2000, 44.

³² As it was poetically expressed in the speech of the cultural minister at that time on the symposium on future cultural policy in Slovenia: “it is important at the same time to be here and there [...] in Slovenia and in Europe“. Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc: *Kulturna politika v Sloveniji, Simpozij*, Fakulteta za družbene vede, Ljubljana, 1998, 13.

³³ Vesna Čopič, „Privatisation and culture: how to separate cultural policy from the provision of culture“, in: *Družboslovne razprave*, Vol. XV, 29, 1999, Slovensko sociološko društvo in Fakulteta za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, 171.

³⁴ *Zakon o kulturnoumetniških dejavnostih in o posredovanju kulturnih vrednot*, I Paragraf, Uradni list SRS (*Official Gazette*), št. 10/84.

³⁵ For more on the establishing NGOs and its contribution toward neoliberal reorganisation see Tina Wallace, “NGO Dilemmas: Trojan Horses for Global Neoliberalism?“, *Socialist Register 2004: The New Imperial Challenge*, Vol 40, 2004, 202-219.

³⁶ Vesna Čopič, “Privatisation and culture: how to separate cultural policy from the provision of culture“, in: *Družboslovne razprave*, Vol. XV, 29, 1999, Slovensko sociološko društvo in Fakulteta za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, 174.

³⁷ For the critique of evaluation of social impact of cultural production see Paola Merli, (2002) Evaluating the social impact of participation in arts activities, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8:1, 107-118.

³⁸ Eda Čufer, “Komentar“, in: Maja Breznik (ed.), *Posebni skepticizam v umetnosti*, Ljubljana, Založba Sophia, 201, 37; Muršič, Rajko, Mladen Bačić [et al.], *Na trdna tla*, Ustanova nevladinih mladinskega polja Pohorski bataljon (UPB), Tolmin, Koper, 2012.

³⁹ Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*, Verso Books, London/NY, 2012, 13.

⁴⁰ Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc, “Threat or Opportunity? Slovenian Cultural Policy in Transition“, in: *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 30:1, 2000, 45.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 51.

⁴² Vesna Čopič, “Privatisation and culture: how to separate cultural policy from

the provision of culture“, in: *Družboslovne razprave*, Vol. XV, 29, 1999, Slovensko sociološko društvo in Fakulteta za družbene vede Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, 175.

⁴³ Precursor and model for GATS was the *General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)* signed in 1948 which was an agreement that enforced progressive liberalization of international trade in goods. GATS was made because of “the growing importance of trade in services for the growth and development of the world economy” and its main goal is “the early achievement of progressively higher levels of liberalization of trade in services”. It recognises state power as “the right of members to regulate and to introduce new regulations, on the supply of services within their territories”. Available online at: General Agreement on Trade in Services, WTO http://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/26-gats.pdf

⁴⁴ In the article *Culture between “l'exception culturelle” and “cultural diversity”*, Maja Breznik shows how international agreements enforce the economic dimension of culture as a decisive factor in formulating the cultural policy.

Although it seems at the first glance that international organizations advocate for lucrative interests of culture or global entertainment industry while the state tries to protect the local (national) culture production, the relation between them is not antagonistic, but complementary. Maja Breznik: “Culture between ‘l'exception culturelle’ and ‘cultural diversity’“, in Aldo Milohnić et al. (ed.): *Culture Ltd., Material Condition of Culture Production*, Peace Institute, Ljubljana, 2005, 15-43.

⁴⁵ Slovenia became a WTO member on July 30, 1995 by signing the Marrakesh agreement and accepting the “Schedule of Specific Commitments”. *Schedule of Specific Commitments*, GATS/SC/99, 03-2735, August 30, 1995, also published in the Uradni list (*Official Gazette*), 1995.

⁴⁶ Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc, *Kulturna politika v Sloveniji, Simpozij*, Fakulteta za družbene vede, Ljubljana, 1998; Vesna Čopič, Gregor Tomc, “Threat or Opportunity? Slovenian Cultural Policy in Transition“, in: *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 30:1, 2000, 46.

⁴⁷ First draft of this document was prepared in the year 2000, while the first *National Cultural Program* was put in power in the year 2004.

⁴⁸ Maja Breznik, *Cultural Revisionism, Culture Between Neo-Liberalism and Social Responsibility*, Peace Institute, Ljubljana, 2004, 62.

⁴⁹ *The Exercising of the Public Interest in Culture Act*, Article 25, Uradni

⁵⁰ Maja Breznik, „Culture in the region and beyond“, see: ICCP, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality: Yeditepe University, Istanbul, 2007-2008., str. 9., dostupno na internetskoj stranici: <http://icpr2008.yeditepe.edu.tr/papers.html> (posljednji uvid 5. studenog 2015.).

⁵¹ Za više informacija o problemu fleksibilizacije i produktivnosti kulturnog djelovanja i kulturnih djelatnika u Sloveniji vidi: Aldo Milohnič, „O ‚produktivizaciji‘ in ‚fleksibilizaciji‘ delavcev (v kulturi)“, *Borec* LXIV, 685-689, Publicistično društvo ZAK, Ljubljana, 2012., str. 232-248.; Aldo Milohnič, „Employment in Culture“, u: Aldo Milohnič i dr. (ur.), *Culture Ltd., Material Condition of Culture Production*, Peace Institute, Ljubljana, 2005., str. 45-67.

⁵² Samozaposleni kulturni radnici godinama upozoravaju javnost i nadležna tijela na svoju nepodnošljivu ekonomsku i socijalnu situaciju. Irena Pivka (i dr.), *Ocena stroškov dela za samozaposlene v kulturi*, Asociacija, Ljubljana, 2010., dostupno na internetskoj stranici: <http://www.asociacija.si/slo/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/analiza-stroski-samozaposleni-KONCNO.pdf> (posljednji uvid 13. studenoga 2015.).

⁵³ Maja Breznik, „Culture in the region and beyond“, see: ICCP, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality: Yeditepe University, Istanbul, 2007-2008., str. 12., dostupno na internetskoj stranici: <http://icpr2008.yeditepe.edu.tr/papers.html> (posljednji uvid 5. studenoga 2015.).

⁵⁴ Citirana je izjava slovenskog koreografa Janeza Janše na *Forumu Maska*, na kojemu su pozvani umjetnici i teoretičari revidirali posljednjih dvadeset godina razvoja slovenske scene suvremenog plesa i mogućnosti njezina razvoja u budućnosti. Andreja Kopač, Amelia Kraigher, „Maska forum: Legalisation of the Contemporary Dance Field, or Moving From Presence To Representation“, *Maska*, Vol. XXXIX, 163-164, 2014., Ljubljana, str. 28.

⁵⁵ *Nacionalni program za kulturu 2014. – 2017.*, dostupan na internetskoj stranici: Ministarstvo za kulturo RS <http://www.mk.gov.si/fileadmin/mk.gov.si/pageuploads/Ministarstvo/Drugo/novice/NET.NPK.pdf> (posljednji uvid 5. studenoga 2015.).

⁵⁶ Andreja Kopač, Amelia Kraigher, „Maska forum: Legalisation of the Contemporary Dance Field, or Moving From Presence To Representation“, *Maska*, Vol. XXXIX, Double Issue 163-164, 2014., Ljubljana, str. 27.

⁵⁷ Maja Breznik, „Culture in the region and beyond“, see: ICCP, Istanbul

Metropolitan Municipality: Yeditepe University, Istanbul, 2007-2008., str. 10., dostupno na internetskoj stranici: <http://icpr2008.yeditepe.edu.tr/papers.html> (posljednji uvid 5. studenoga 2015.).

⁵⁸ *Isto*, str. 11.

⁵⁹ Clive Gray, „Commodification and Instrumentality in Cultural Policy“, u: *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13: 2, 2007., str. 203-215.

⁶⁰ Za više informacija o problemu uniformiranosti, standardizacije i kapitalističke estetike vidi: Amelia Kraigher, „Umiranje na obroke“, *Večer*, 710., 2015., dostupno na internetskoj stranici: <http://www.vecer.com/clanek/201510156150062> (posljednji uvid 29. listopada 2015.).

S engleskog na hrvatski prevela: Ivana Bertić

List RS (*Official Gazette*), No. 96, November 14, 2002, available online at: Pravno-informacijski servis RS <http://www.pisrs.si/Pis.web/pregledPredpisa?id=ZAKO381> (last accessed 13 November 2015).

⁵⁰ Maja Breznik, „Culture in the region and beyond“, v: ICCP, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality: Yeditepe University, Istanbul, 2007-2008, 9, available online at <http://icpr2008.yeditepe.edu.tr/papers.html>.

⁵¹ For more about the problem of flexibilisation and productivity of cultural work(ers) in Slovenia see Aldo Milohnič, „O ‚produktivizaciji‘ in ‚fleksibilizaciji‘ delavcev (v kulturi)“, *Borec* LXIV, 685-689, Publicistično društvo ZAK, Ljubljana, 2012, 232-248; Aldo Milohnič, „Employment in Culture“, in: Aldo Milohnič et al. (ed.), *Culture Ltd., Material Condition of Culture Production*, Peace Institute, Ljubljana, 2005, 45-67.

⁵² For years, self-employed in culture have been alerting the public and the authorities about their intolerable economic and social situation. Irena Pivka (et al.), *Ocena stroškov dela za samozaposlene v kulturi*, Asociacija, Ljubljana, 2010, available online at: [Asociacija <http://www.asociacija.si/slo/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/analiza-stroski-samozaposleni-KONCNO.pdf>](http://www.asociacija.si/slo/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/analiza-stroski-samozaposleni-KONCNO.pdf) (last accessed 13 November 2015).

⁵³ Maja Breznik, „Culture in the region and beyond“, v: ICCP, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality: Yeditepe University, Istanbul, 2007-2008, 12, available online at <http://icpr2008.yeditepe.edu.tr/papers.html> (last accessed 5 November 2015).

⁵⁴ The quotation was expressed by the Slovenian choreographer Janez Janša at the *Maska forum* where invited artists and theoreticians were re-thinking the last twenty year of development of the Slovene contemporary dance and possibilities for its future. Andreja Kopač, Amelia Kraigher: „Maska forum: Legalisation of the Contemporary Dance Field, or Moving From Presence To Representation“, *Maska*, Vol. XXIX, 163-164, 2014, Ljubljana, 28.

⁵⁵ The *National Culture Programme 2014–2017*, available online at: Ministarstvo za kulturo RS <http://www.mk.gov.si/fileadmin/mk.gov.si/pageuploads/Ministarstvo/Drugo/novice/NET.NPK.pdf> (last accessed 5 November 2015).

⁵⁶ Andreja Kopač, Amelia Kraigher, „Maska forum: Legalisation of the Contemporary Dance Field, or Moving From Presence To Representation“, *Maska*, Vol. XXIX, Double Issue 163-164, 2014, Ljubljana, 27.

⁵⁷ Maja Breznik, „Culture in the region and beyond“, v: ICCP, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality: Yeditepe University, Istanbul, 2007-2008, 10, available online at <http://icpr2008.yeditepe.edu.tr/papers.html> (last accessed 5 November 2015).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 11.

⁵⁹ Clive Gray, „Commodification and Instrumentality in Cultural Policy“, in: *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13:2, 2007, 203-215.

⁶⁰ For more on the problem of uniformity, standardisation and capitalistic aesthetics see: Amelia Kraigher, „Umiranje na obroke“, *Večer*, 710, 2015. Available online at: [Večer <http://www.vecer.com/clanek/201510156150062>](http://www.vecer.com/clanek/201510156150062), (last accessed 29 October 2015).