

Jelena Petrović

What Does Freedom Stand for Today?¹

We speak today about a crisis in contemporary social movements. This crisis has been produced in part by our failure to develop a meaningful and collective historical consciousness. Such a consciousness would entail recognition that our victories attained by freedom movements are never etched in stone. What we often perceive under one set of historical conditions as glorious triumphs of mass struggle can later ricochet against us if we do not continually reconfigure the terms and transform the terrain of our struggle. The struggle must go on. Transformed circumstances require new theories and practices.

Angela Davis, *The Meaning of Freedom: And Other Difficult Dialogues*²

Impossibility to change neoliberal systems which shape and oppress everyday life on all social levels, as well as the simultaneous and paradoxical act of reproducing and resisting dominant social structures (a side effect of contemporary emancipatory politics), put us in the position to rethink what the politics of liberation or its revolutionary practices of today are. The attribute “revolutionary,” means that those practices are politically engaged and socially transformative in a very concrete context. The fact is that all social revolutions have emerged outside of dominant ideological, economical, and political structures in order to cope with the unbearable conditions of common life in certain times. Each of them generated a new social order grounded in the radical imagination of everyday life. In other words, social revolutions always fought for freedom, social justice and new liberating legality through “illegal” means. But what happens when all those facts become romanticized versions of possible futures and when the freedom is (ab)used as a key concept of neoliberal society?

Dealing with this question, my intention is to underline the false dichotomy between the meaning of legality and illegality when it comes to difficult questions on the contemporary total War on Terror(ism), which shapes the actual state of global crisis, and at the same time escapes the real political questions that we should face. Freedom appears at this point as a fundamental and arbitrary notion of neoliberal society, a notion that justifies the state of war (consisting of all recent and actual political, economical, social crises) and develops through it further “liberal” interests and inequalities. The actual means of democratic defense of humanity, such as: military interventions, austerity measures, refugee policies, humanitarian aid, migration laws, human rights, etc., are discursively and ideologically based on the

meaning of freedom. Those means (co)produce the neoliberal mechanisms of global governmentality, as well as the permanent state of crisis, conflict and terror. Such inverted-horizons of freedom exclude any critical way of thinking, educating, organizing, resisting, and living outside the neoliberal concept of legality today. The false choice between legal and illegal means of social resistance, of political struggle for freedom opens up questions on the limits of political, theoretical and artistic practices as well the question of resisting responsibility and revolutionary subjectivity. Following the red thread of recent theoretical and art-theory works, this text looks for the meaning of freedom, which is antagonistically contextualized by neoliberal and revolutionary understandings of contemporary permanent war today. The war that made people lives illegal.

The State of Permanent War

The prevailing apparatus of the neoliberal state, constructed through the model of arbitrary freedom and its manipulative liberal values, does not produce only class, race, gender and many other social/economic/political/cultural diversifications through the oppressive politics of identity and its economy of brutal exploitation, but rather “human waste” (human-as-waste) through administrative and managing mechanisms of the contemporary war: permanent and global. There are at least three theoretical cross-referential understanding of the meaning of “human waste”: symbolic, bio-political, and politico-economic. The first two approaches re/produce social order that is achieved through inscription of pollution, danger, redundancy, contamination into the Other by violent means of so-called social purification and protection (intervention).³ The difference is in the individual or collective constitution of humans-as-waste as a threat at the level of the population. The Marxist critique is based on a third politico-economic approach, which examines humans-as-waste as a byproduct of the capitalist mode of production.⁴

Marina Gržinić’s definition of the war-state shaped by force, violence, and fear is the most precise definition of the neoliberal state, the definition that goes beyond the historical meaning of the fascist state in order to underline “what the major logic of dominance in the world today is, and this logic is the logic of war.”⁵ According to Gržinić the war-state has elements of historical fascism, such as: “a sovereign leader, people, death as the management of life”, but also elements of present neoliberalism, such as: individual freedom and autonomy as a crucial right. Referring to Santiago López Petit, she explains the notion of postmodern fascism as a form of self-governmentality based on the self-management of a proper autonomy of differences for which the cohesive element is war. Such a war-state twists the meaning of the capitalist nation-state in order to “sterilize the Other, evacuate the conflict from public space and neutralize the political”⁶ constantly demanding: “a proliferation of unbelievable “freedom” of particularities”⁷ for which the best example is the reconciling agenda of human rights, which keeps strong borders of power between central and peripheral identities.

Following historical events, we can say that global or total war officially started in response to the attacks on September 11, 2001, when the Bush administration initiated an international military campaign known as the War on Terror (or the War on Terrorism). Led by the United States and the United Kingdom with NATO support, the War on Terror was waged initially against al-Qaeda and other terrorist organizations but soon expanded to include Saddam Hussein and Iraq and so forth. The attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were transformed into occasions to abuse and manipulate collective grief, to reduce it to a national desire for vengeance for which freedom and democracy became exportable commodities: “commodities that can be sold or imposed upon entire populations whose resistances are aggressively suppressed by the military [...]. Bloodshed and belligerence in the name of freedom and democracy!”⁸ Appropriating the idea of freedom and democracy while making use of the permanent financial crises and fear of terror, the neoliberal means of war production prevent(ed) any radical possibility of political subjectivization against the war on terror or the possibility of confronting its permanency. Catherine Hass points out that: the contemporary war is necessarily a permanent one, because there is no intrinsic political, subjective goal that would determine its end THE PEACE. The question that appears in the title of her PhD thesis “*Qu'appelle-t-on une guerre? Enquête sur le nom de guerre aujourd'hui*” (What does the name war stand for today?) testifies to this current state of war, its permanence and necessity, the purpose of which, as emphasized by Catharine Hass, is not the achievement of peace,⁹ because the differentiation between war and peace doesn't exist anymore. Such contemporary global war, as a war without limits, is managed by other political conditions, such as: legal military intervention, arms-trade agreements in the name of freedom, and the defense of democracy and human rights.

The definition of “war-state” as well as contemporary war today leads us to the conclusion that neoliberality of global capitalism is the formative ideology of the total war that produces a permanent state of economic, political and social crisis, as well “human waste.” Today, with the imperative of democratic citizenship, the self-righteous first world politics serves to justify and pacify repressive forms of the new final solution. By introducing a new binary opposition: illegal/legal, while claiming human rights as a tool of neoliberal systematic restructuration, this final solution offers false, but also the ultimate choice between the permanent war for global security (in other words, WOT) and any radical form of resistance to the neoliberal fist world society (preemptively signified as a terrorist or illegal one). Instead of such choice, we should point out the following questions: Who are all those illegal, undocumented, non-allowed, non-belonging, non-xyz “bastards” who resist or just stay outside those legalized neoliberal oppressive structures? What if only “being illegal” can break through the repressive neoliberal system of the global inequality that we live in? Or simply: How to (re)build an idea of social revolution, or make a radical collective change today beyond all those appropriated/abused notions of freedom, as well beyond recycled/emptied vocabulary which is coming from the history of previous revolutionary struggles and resistances?

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF FREEDOM?

Is the question that Angela Davis posed in her writings after so many years of fighting, thinking and resisting the repressive mechanisms in power structures of our contemporary world.¹⁰ Due to the most idealistic vain, such freedom is a permanent struggle—that refers to the term of permanent revolution which is a base for society emancipation and freedom gained through struggle/resistance/revolution etc.)—a radically different future, a fundamental social precondition for an emancipatory collective transformation beyond slavery, colonialism, racism, patriarchy, capitalism, fascism and so forth. But, at the same time through substantial historical events and material (post)ideological transformations of state, freedom became the most expensive word of the globalized neoliberal society.¹¹ Today, the meaning of freedom is (ab)used as a fetishizing synonym for the law of those who have permanently established themselves within the neoliberal system of political and economic power. Envisioning revolutionary freedom through the larger collective claim for a new society (unity), requiring the radical emancipatory conception of complex community beyond existing power structures of the neoliberal state and its regulative and oppressive apparatus, Davis reminds that freedom is a process of becoming. In other words, it is a process “of being able to see and understand difference within unity, and resisting the tendency to reproduce the hierarchies embedded in the world we want to change.”¹²

According to Kelley’s introduction to Davis’s book, the idea that an across-the-board community of complexity and differences will be founded on justice and equality, as well the provision of education, health care, and housing and the abolition of the police and capitalist state is totally opposite to the idea of the neoliberal society.¹³ It is important to highlight that such an idea of neoliberal society, which appropriated the meaning of freedom, is not the recent one. Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman and others proposed it as a capitalist mode of ultimate freedom after the WWII. The Mont Pelerin Society, (named after the hotel near Montreux, Switzerland, where the first meeting was convened by Hayek) was established in 1947 by famous economists, philosophers, intellectuals as well eight winners of the Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences (including von Mises, Hayek, Friedman), proclaimed freedom as a ground value of the liberal state. Freedom of expression, free market economic policies, the political values of an open society became markers of classic liberalism through this international organization. Marginalized during the Fordist era and the Keynesian welfare state, subsequently the Mont Pelerin Society became more and more influential, until the post 1970s when it became one of the most influential ideological and theoretical grounds of global regulatory reformation, which enables the rise of neoliberalism under US hegemony.¹⁴ Referring to Lidija Radojević, such a process of market-oriented regulatory restructuring of social production changed the meaning and the role of the state in accordance with locally specific geographical and historical conditions. The neoliberal state was born with its aim to establish a proper institutional environment for structuring the behavior of its citizens and (re)producing simultaneously the state power as well the eternal border between legal and illegal—in order to make impossible any resistance to it.¹⁵

It brings us to the thesis that all dimensions of the everyday life within the neoliberal

system today are reduced to market rationality, by means of individualized social relations that are formed through profitability, normativity and competition. In other words, the neoliberal system (state) manages the notion of civic/civil subject and transforms the citizens and their knowledge and abilities into human capital—its initial investments. It also includes one's ability to strategically plan and organize one's own life—one's individual choice to estimate what is profitable, useful and successful, as well as individual responsibility and self-care. Social differences and political paradigms created binary oppositions such as minority/majority, center/periphery, private/public and universal/particular that have also an important place in civil/civic subjectivization. Culturalized systemic differences (established on traditional categories of ethnicity, gender and class) produced a multicultural society in which those economic and political differences were fragmented and neutralized through the politics of diversity and the ideology of reconciliation and tolerance (human rights). The common signifier of those diverse communities of individuals—consisting of such civil subjects, is actually *homo oeconomicus*: an entrepreneur of himself.¹⁶

Owing to the fact that we are all fixed by this globalized neoliberal mode of social (re)production, which abused the idea of freedom against ourselves, we can say that past drives for freedom and historical means of emancipatory movements and revolutionary struggle does not function anymore. In such material-neoliberal conditions, freedom lost its historical, revolutionary meaning of collective struggle, because it was distributed to individuals as a commodity of identity (self)production. On the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Black Panthers (1966), we can see how the embeddedness of revolutionary freedom in the globalizing, democratizing world functions as a global “cultural heritage,” consumption norm, aesthetic value, fashion or very pale repetition of revolutionary rhetoric which doesn't make much sense in the material conditions that we live in. It appears rather as a lethargic feeling of misleading nostalgia. A few years ago, addressing the Occupy movement, Angela Davis said that what we need instead of such deceiving repetition of old revolutionary folklore, are new ideas and strategies for a revolutionary social change, for a radical future that will bring us out of this unbearable neoliberal lives: “More than once I have heard people say, ‘If only a new Black Panther Party could be organized, then we could seriously deal with The Man, you know?’ But suppose we were to say: ‘There is no Man anymore.’ There is suffering. There is oppression. There is terrifying racism. But this racism does not come from the mythical ‘Man.’ Moreover, it is laced with sexism and homophobia and unprecedented class exploitation associated with a dangerously globalized capitalism. We need new ideas and new strategies that will take us into the twenty-first century.”¹⁷

Freedom as Radically Different Future

What does today's art offer for understanding and radicalizing the meaning of freedom beyond the existing society, or more precisely, beyond the neoliberal state? For sure, it produces a glitch that calls for social imagination of a radically different future, for emancipatory reconceptualization of the community, as well for political (re)articulation of the most emergent issues of today. In other words, today's art produces the politics of error that interrupts our social reality with a counter-

historical emergency of facing the present, shifting in-between, unspoken history and utopian/dystopian future. The “politics of error” is introduced here as a new concept, dealing with an impossibility to break through artistic or cultural institutional structures and ossified academic worlds, with rare exceptions. Such error, as a symptom of living contemporaneity, indicates: dislocation and new location, visibility and presence of the invisible, possibility and freedom of experimentation, and many other transformative promises.

There are artworks or art-projects which actualize, conceptualize and imagine the politics of freedom beyond existing neoliberal, patriarchal, colonial modes of society. The red thread of singular meaning of these radically different futures could be traced through some of the following paradigmatic examples.

Naked Freedom (2010) is a film/video-work by artist-theoretician Marina Gržinić and Aina Šmid. They are a duo who create artistic situations for being, co-thinking and co-creating with others. The video starts with an Achille Mbembe quote: “What connects terror, death, and freedom is an ecstatic notion of temporality and politics.”¹⁸ The film focuses on deregulation of social life within globalized capitalism through an attempt to be socially engaged, politically creative and radically free. Authors experimentally approach the mode of reconceptualization of the community. With reference to Soviet filmmakers Vertov and Eisenstein and their mode of political montage, Gržinić and Šmid put in question the usual means of art production (which is today socially twisted and politically predictable). They problematize the issue of (neo)liberal (neo)colonialism through the discussion between Kwame Nimako and Marina Gržinić, filmed at a workshop on Education, Development, Freedom held at Duke University, in February 2010.¹⁹ The discussion reveals the relocation of global borders and peripheries today, lost moments of possible radical communities, as well the instabilities and restrictions that have been already incorporated in new global narratives and impossible movements. Referring to the Nimako’s claim: “We are here (in the EU), because you were there (in Africa),” Gržinić said: “We are here (in the EU), because you want to go there (to Eastern Europe).” This opens up the question of complicity of understanding the whole set of (post)colonial relations within the common struggle (for “complex unity”) against the systematic violence and neoliberal legitimatizing of oppression of global capitalism.

New World Summit (NWS) initiated by Jonas Staal uses the field of art to reimagine a space for a fundamental practice of democracy today. NWS was established as an artistic and political organization in 2012.²⁰ Since then, it is dedicated to providing “alternative parliaments” that host organizations, which currently are, or consider themselves, excluded from democracy. As it is stated by the project, New World Summit opposes the misuse of the concept of democracy for expansionist, military and colonial gains to which the organization refers as “democratism” such as WOT. This concept rejects the model of the nation-state and accepts of an ideology of self-governance at all levels of society through the discipline of performing the stateless democracy. So, relating to the art practice or more precisely to the form, or to the morphology of art, this project (re)introduces the notion of revolutionary realism as “the kind of reality that becomes possible through a revolutionary practice, but [is] not yet present.” According to Staal, revolutionary realism rejects the script: “that define

what is the realistic and what is utopian, what proper citizenship is and what the terrorist act is. Revolutionary realism focuses on shaping new possible realities once we have rejected the forms that structure our current performance, in this case specifically controlled within the stage of nation-state.”²¹

The materiality, form, and morphology of such an ideology is in a process of permanent transformation of both art and politics through the practice of stateless democracy.²²

Another form of state appears within the art-theory field, as well within the global politics of power relations and that is “state within state” or better known as deep state (coming from the Turkish term *Derin Devlet*). Karen Mirza and Brad Butler, through their artistic practice, particularly their project titled *The Museum of (Non)Participation*,²³ which represents the process of investigation of the terms and conditions of images, objects, collaboration, dialogue and the social. In 2012, with China Miéville and the art-activist group Mosireen, they made a science-fiction-inflected protest “training film” called *Deep State*, which starts from different moments of political resistance and struggle, particularly those that took place in Egypt in 2011 (so-called revolutionary struggles to achieve “democracy and freedom”). The deep state is not possible to prove, it has special interests and generates relationships of real power, it makes fundamental decisions that “often run counter to the outward of impression of democracy.”²⁴ This film, through popular protests and legislated acts of violence and containment, traces the fluid and invisible influences that impact the state. Through a vivid montage of newly filmed and archival footage, which put into continuum: past, present and future, the film follows the clashes between the rioter (running for freedom) and the deep state (non-regulated by democracy). The process of disappointment, loss and limitation of utopian visions within existing contemporary democratic society is at the same time the process of liberation from the deep state (the state of dictatorship). This film not only puts existing narrations of protesting and resistance into question, but also the notions of democracy and freedom within the neoliberal capitalist state, which stands against “deep state” (loosely synonymous with the shadow government) as the only possible option of the postmodern world where history has ended.

The politics of glitch or the aesthetics of error is present in many artworks dealing with the meaning of freedom. Looking into the bare images of Margareta Kern’s animation work *To Whom Does the World Belong?*,²⁵ we face the political montage that uses stop/slow motion animation, drawings, voice, poetry recordings, video documentation, sounds and silences, and this produces an inner voice which directs us, occupies our thoughts, and reorients our actions, while simultaneously creating the syncretic experience (aesthesis) of affect production. A voice can be heard signaling the end of trading at a stock exchange, lines of poetry are drawing the contours of a woman’s body, a body that is being dragged along a street in Egypt during the Arab Spring of 2011. Society defeated, a woman beaten-up by the police on one side, the neoliberal state and contemporary patriarchy on the other, feature in an image that has travelled the world. The war to end dictatorship, soon turns into the War on Terror. It becomes a permanent, necessary and constituent agent of the survival of neoliberalism, which lurks in the background of this image. (Non)framing

political acts by the media, such as a failed revolution and a permanent war, thus coproduce a social actuality by placing the *actual* (visible) in place of the *real* (invisible). Using the political montage of the affect—the necessary glitch in the process of image animation—Margareta Kern does not just *draw* us in, but rather drags us into the world to which we belong. This political spectacle of a scratched frame, of an animation suspended in the moment of aesthetic glitch, is at the same time the red thread of this work—the thread which unravels the body of the state, economics and art. Documentary records chronicling global social circumstances in the era of neoliberalism overlap with the animation, which performs a forensic deconstruction of those images, fragmenting them to frame the real, invisible and empty places of a necessary political subjectivization. Contemporary society's revolt against the state are glimpsed in the animated documentary records of the protests: against tuition fees (England, 2010), against budget cuts on healthcare (Spain, 2012), against dictatorship (Egypt, 2011), etc. The revolt, which demands freedom, social rights (labour, healthcare and education rights) and human dignity (equality) is here condensed into frames that do not show, but (re)produce the *status quo* of everyday politics. The voice of each individual political subject within the collective body of revolt, the interrupted, cutup voice of animation questions if it is at all possible to produce effective images of revolt, protest and revolution in the world of today.²⁶

Beyond theoretical thinking about limits and promises of a social Utopia, as well beyond aesthetic questions about non-presentable universality of great events and its images, there are creative processes and practices that involves excess/resistance, freedom and yet non-existing political as well as art(istic) singularity. Jean-Luc Nancy points out that the term “singular” in Latin—*singuli*—already announces its plurality: “The singular is primarily each one and, therefore, also with and among all the others. The singular is a plural.”²⁷ Despite this paradox, the notions of singularity and plurality are not opposite, they co-determine each other: each singularity is always another in a plurality of “being-with” others. The key point is that being can only relate to being-with-one-another, in terms of being-in-common, to create a radically different community. In that sense, artistic practices which appear today as singular insights into the world of the neoliberalism (as an ultimate form of oppression today) or as singular ruptures that politicize the space and time (by not accepting the neoliberal meanings of freedom, as well the neoliberal dichotomy of (il)legality, particularly when it comes to the resistance) co-create another singularity through being-with others, which calls for radical change. They co-create *another singularity* that has potential to break through societal and political as well post-ideological social orders of the present and the past; this singularity shows the future beyond multiplied classes and identities of today's neoliberal, patriarchal, and colonial reality.

Literature

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Brown, Wendy. "Neoliberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy." In *Edgework: Critical Essay on Knowledge and Politics*, pp. 37–60. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Davis, Angela Y. *The Meaning of Freedom: And Other Difficult Dialogues*. San Francisco: City Light Books, 2012.

Dimitrijević, Olga, and Maja Pelević. *Freedom: The Most Expensive Capitalist Word*. Belgrade: Bitef Production, 2016. <http://festival.bitef.rs/event/freedom-expensive-capitalist-word/>.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London, UK: Routledge, 1966.

Foucault, Michel. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*. New York, NY: Picador, 2003.

— — —. *The Birth of Biopolitics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Gržinić, Marina, and Aina Šmid. "Čista sloboda/Naked Freedom (2010)," *grzinic-smid*, February 13, 2013. <http://grzinic-smid.si/?p=413>.

Gržinić, Marina. "From Biopolitics to Necropolitics and the Institution of Contemporary Art," *Pavilion, Journal for Politics and Culture*, no. 14 (2010): 9–94.

— — —. "Images of Struggle, Politics and Decoloniality." By Kwame Nimako. *kronotop.org*, 2015. <http://www.kronotop.org/ftexts/interview-with-marina-grzinic/>.

Hass, Catherina. "Qu'appelle-t-on une *guerre*? Enquête sur le nom de guerre aujourd'hui." Phd diss., Université Paris 8, Paris, 2001.

Kern, Margareta. "To Whom Does the World Belong?" (2013–15). <http://www.margaretakern.com/>.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Marx, Karl. *Capital, Volume 1*. New York: Penguin Books, 1976.

— — —. *Capital, Volume 3*. New York: Penguin Books, 1981.

Mbembe, Achille. "Necropolitics." Translated by Libby Meintjes. *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (2003): 11–40.

Mirza, Karen, and Brad Butler. *The Museum of Non Participation* (blog). <http://www.museumofnonparticipation.org/>.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Being Singular Plural*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Petrović, Jelena. "The Politics of Glitch or Aesthetics of Error?" Catalogue of Margareta Kern's solo exhibition "To Whom Does the World Belong?" Cultural Center Belgrade, November 2015.

Radojević, Lidija. "Shifting the Locality of Neoliberalism." Presentation at the symposium "the Illegality of Freedom," Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, December 11, 2016.

Read, Jason. "A Genealogy of Homo Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity." Special issue, "The Birth of Biopolitics," *Foucault Studies*, no. 6 (February 2009): 25–36.

Staal, Jonas. "IDEOLOGY=FORM." *e-flux journal*, no. 69 (January 2016). <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/69/60626/ideology-form/>.

Staal, Jonas et al. *New World Summit* (2012–). <http://newworldsummit.org>.

¹ The text is published in: *Border Thinking*, ed. Marina Gržinić (Academy of Fine Arts Vienna and Stenberg Press Berlin, 2017). I would like to thank the editor and publishers of the book *Border Thinking* for permission to republish and translate the text into the Turkish language.

² Angela Y. Davis, *The Meaning of Freedom: And Other Difficult Dialogues* (San Francisco: City Light Books, 2012), 19.

³ Symbolic approaches to humans-as-waste mostly engage the work of Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London, UK: Routledge, 1966); and Julia Kristeva *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), relating to the meaning of abject and abjection as a process of being expelled, thrown down, debased, and humiliated. Biopolitical approaches are generally based by Michel Foucault's writings on biopolitics and state racism (Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*, New York, NY: Picador, 2003); Giorgio Agamben's on homo sacer and "bare life" (Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998); and Achille Mbembe's on necropolitics (Mbembe, "Necropolitics," trans. by Libby Meintjes, *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (2003): 11–40.).

⁴ Marx argues that capitalism perpetually generates human accumulation in the form of a "surplus population" of workers (*Capital, Volume 1*, New York: Penguin Books, 1976), and, moreover,

“squanders human beings, living labor,” resulting in a “waste of the workers’ life and health” (*Capital, Volume 3*, New York: Penguin Books, 1981).

⁵ Marina Gržinić, “From Biopolitics to Necropolitics and the Institution of Contemporary Art,” *Pavilion*, no. 14, (2010): 53.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid., 59.

⁸ Davis, *Meaning of Freedom*, 89–90.

⁹ See Catherina Hass, “Qu’appelle-t-on une guerre? Enquête sur le nom de guerre aujourd’hui,” (PhD diss, Université Paris 8, Paris, 2001).

¹⁰ Ibid. The title of the Angela Davis’s book consists of collections of public speeches, interviews, texts, and so on.

¹¹ *Freedom: The Most Expensive Capitalist Word* is the title of the theater play based on the authors’ research trip to the world’s most isolated country—North Korea. The two authors, Maja Pelević and Olga Dimitrijević, question the idea of freedom in the era of ever-intensifying global surveillance, and face the existing propaganda and dominant stereotypes of the North Korean totalitarian regime and Western neoliberal democracies. See <http://festival.bitef.rs/event/freedom-expensive-capitalist-word/>.

¹² Robin D. G. Kelley, foreword to Angela Y. Davis, *Meaning of Freedom*, 14.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Lidija Radojević, “The Illegality of Freedom” (lecture, Academy of Fine Arts, Vienna, December 11, 2016), <https://www.akbild.ac.at/Portal/institute/kunst-und-kulturwissenschaften/konferenzen/2016/the-illegality-of-freedom>.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ From Michel Foucault: “*Homo Economicus* is an entrepreneur, an entrepreneur of himself.” Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 226. From Wendy Brown: “Citizen-subject as neoliberal entrepreneur in every aspect of the life in neoliberal society.” Wendy Brown, “Neoliberalism and End of Liberal Democracy,” in *Edgework: Critical Essay on Knowledge and Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 42–44. From Jason Read: “Neoliberalism through the prism of particular production of subjectivity as well as through the ways in which individuals are constructed as subjects of human capital.” Jason Read, “A Genealogy of Homo Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity,” in “The Birth of Biopolitics,” special issue, *Foucault Studies*, no. 6 (February 2009): 25–36.

¹⁷ Davis, *Meaning of Freedom*, 18.

¹⁸ Marina Gržinić and Aina Šmid, “Čista sloboda (Naked Freedom) 2010,” February 13, 2013, <http://grzinic-smid.si/?p=413>

¹⁹ “Images of Struggle, Politics and Decoloniality,” by Kwame Nimako, *kronotop.org* (2015), <http://www.kronotop.org/ftexts/interview-with-marina-grzinic/>

²⁰ See “About” section, *New World Summit*, <http://newworldsummit.org>.

²¹ Jonas Staal, “IDEOLOGY=FORM,” *e-flux journal*, no. 69 (January 2016): 5, <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/69/60626/ideology-form/>.

²² Ibid., 7.

²³ See “About” section on *Museum of Non Participation*, <http://www.museumofnonparticipation.org/>.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ See <http://www.margaretakern.com/>.

²⁶ See Jelena Petrović, “The Politics of Glitch or Aesthetics of Error?” in the catalogue of Margareta Kern’s solo exhibition “To Whom Does the World Belong?” at the Cultural Center Belgrade, November 2015.

²⁷ Jean-Luc Nancy, *Being Singular Plural* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), 32.