

Standing Still Dancing in a Circle – Performance Dissent and Failed Gestures in Public Protest

Johannes Birringer

For seeing life is but a motion of Limbs, the beginning thereof is in some principall part within; why may we not say, that all *Automata* (Engines that move themselves by springs and wheels as doth a watch) have an artificial life? For what is the *Heart*, but a *Spring*; and the *Nerves*, but so many *Strings*; and the *Joynts*, but so many *Wheels*, giving motion to the whole body, such as was intended by the Artificer?

(Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 1651)

1. The State of Mortality

Thinking through bodies in crisis evokes images or rather evokes turbulence, disruptions close to home or closer to the skin, endangering the health, integrity and safety we like to believe belonging to the realms in which we live. The presumption of a common-wealth or safe haven is of course only a presumption. Many people do not have the comfort of living in peace, in safety, or in a sustainable environment, and the linking of social justice and space – “spatial justice” – is a complex, precarious notion. At the same time, an analysis of the interactions between space and society would seem quite necessary for understanding social injustices, and to formulate territorial policies aiming at transforming them or making them overt. Especially so if we follow the suggestion of the editors of this book, namely that the reconfiguration of biopolitics into death politics (necropolitics) in our time has dire consequences for any performative ethos and politics of living bodies claiming space, as such still living *bodies* become the locus and symptom of social trauma.(1)

How, then, do bodies perform in traumatized space, fending off the end of the social contract? Rather than speaking of “the body” as a generalized or abstracted term, I prefer to think of particular bodies and collectivities, bodies in motion and, as Hobbes implies in his theory of the

gigantic Leviathan state, man-made artificial engines as the other of nature, the opposite of the state of nature. This opposition has also created trauma: danger is like a storm or a flood or a breaking of the levees. I remember hurricane “Katrina” breaking the common-wealth and the state of a city near where I live. The state was stratified, and the poorer population in New Orleans found itself less safe. The Lower Ninth Ward, one of the largest black neighborhoods, was all but erased by the flood, and performance artists (e.g. Paul Chan’s *Waiting for Godot in New Orleans*) later on staged their melancholic eulogies of the bleak silence that descended. Such breakings are considered natural disasters, difficult to fend against although the levees were precisely that – artificial borders against the flooding. The engineering failed in New Orleans, while the social engineering of a racialized state succeeded – the neglect of disadvantaged populations pushed them further towards the margins and over the edge, permitting their disposability and the disposability of their homes (Giroux 2006: 174). As Hobbes also implies, the state is artificial and works through artifices, and since it holds the highest authority on earth, it can be likened to a “*Mortall God*” to whom we should owe our peace and security.

In the following, I will address bodies in motion (and in slowed-down stillness), with reference to performance art and activism observed in our time, my own life time on both sides of the Atlantic coinciding with the rise of live art/body art in the West (since the 1960s). And this coincidence, like my work in the theatre, has proven fruitful in the sense that it has provided the context for my own analysis of conceptual constructions, for example the artifices of theatrical gestures or social choreographies that open out to questions of authorization and collective will, of self-endangering and public protest, their effectiveness or futility, the latter predicated on the very abstractions (in modern avant-garde art) that proved their compromised nature, with current discursive emphasis on corporeality/embodiment functioning as a kind of camouflage. Embodiment is evoked when expropriation and dispossession have become nearly irreversible, and human rights violations are normalized. The “West,” like its dialectical other, the “East,” are of course also generalized abstractions that need to be questioned, especially when Western ethics of spatial justice are still exported universally while capitalism (and the capitalist art market) continues its unrestrained circular logic. In order to counter-balance my familiarity with European and North American live art, I will refer to performance actions and their documentations in other regions to query aesthetic and mythological toolboxes, the (re)mixing of strategies or blurring of the familiar. Furthermore, the abstraction of “the body” as locus of trauma or of “bare life” is not convincing, unless specific instances of such disposable life and social death can help us to define what kind of spatial justice, as a reflection of necropolitics, is rendered at stake, what kind of negotiations

are possible still, and thus what kind of defiance of controlling sovereignty is possible and performable.

Thinking of a state of mortality has become more pressing over the past decade when the so-called “war on terror” (after the September 11, 2001, attacks against the World Trade Center in New York) unleashed by the United States has comprehensively reminded us that we do not live in a postmilitant culture. I grew up in a post-war country (whose reconstruction was enabled by the same United States), and was a young student when the Red Army Faction in Germany, alongside a generation of left intellectuals, artists, filmmakers and writers, incited an extremism we deemed necessary to understanding the suppressed memory of fascism and the Holocaust, prying that suppressed memory open to show the wounds. Yet it now appears dangerous to feel nostalgic about the struggles of the 1970s in light of both the neo-colonial political violence of “vertical sovereignty” and “splintering occupation” (Mbembe 2003: 28) as practiced by the US, Israel, Russia or China for example, and the demonstrations and revolutionary protests spreading across countries in North Africa and the Middle East on the other hand, followed by the formation of ISIS and the West’s troubled reaction to the brutality of contemporary Jihadist fundamentalism.

The RAF ideology of armed struggle failed; meanwhile, the credo of non-violent resistance, after the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi, seemed to have failed, too. In the current exhibition *Experiments with Truth: Gandhi and Images of Nonviolence* at the Menil Collection in Houston, Indian documentary filmmaker Amar Kanwar treats Gandhi’s non-violent opposition as an unresolved question, demanding, in the words of Gandhi that the filmmaker’s soft voice-over repeats, *a decision*: at what point of degradation do you arm yourself with the truth, and what truth? Engaging the viewer in manifold ways of seeing and comprehending, the documentary *A Season Outside* (1998) harnesses a set of propositions that investigate the notion of what Kanwar calls “poetry as evidence.” But it opens out with a strange dance on the Wagah border – the line that divides Pakistan and India – the camera amongst the crowd of people who gather to watch the “change of guard” ceremony that happens there every evening. The sights and sounds of the place —voices, flags, barbed wires, badges, uniforms, people’s faces, and, the border line itself—seem filled with the expectation of finding an answer to what stirred the violence of national partition in 1947. But Kanwar’s camera looks at the scene as if for the first time, by stretching and fragmenting time. After a slow pan that starts from a lighted shed across the barbed wire fence at night, we see quickly cut together feet, identification badges, people, and

colors. The ritualized military border ceremony becomes a slow dance of goose-stepping soldiers whose fascination for our collective psyche rests in its repetitive military performance of a violent past that will not abide.(2)

Kanwar thus evokes the border both as the concrete evidence of violence, and also as a symbol. Its power runs deeper than the physical limits, it traverses the postcolonial archive just as his other film in the exhibition, *The Scene of the Crime* (2012), purviews the natural landscape of the eastern coastal state of Odisha ahead of acquisition and division by rapacious multinational corporate industry for commercial use. The film, part of a larger installation (*The Sovereign Forest*), approaches the body politic, the subaltern protagonists, situationally and locally, reflecting on a “war against the people and their land” (Kanwar) by presenting a range of poetic evidence in multiple forms and vocabularies, legal and personal artefacts, traces, framed documentation and ephemera, including residents’ proof of right to occupy, and many small wooden baskets displaying the 266 different varieties of rice seeds brought together from the terrain of crime, pointing to the disappearance of indigenous crops and the influence of global agriculture and high-yield sterile seeds on small farmers. Kanwar also adds exquisite, handmade books with texts silk-screened onto banana-fibre paper. Video images projected from above onto the right side of the books tell lyrical and moving stories about the local farmers. Visiting the exhibit, we have to turn these pages and touch the evidence, so to speak, as we decode the allegories that spell dispossession and mortality. Geeta Kapur suggests that the implied locus of the work is “body-language,” and “material metonymies that map desire” of displaced human bodies positioned in contiguous relationship with the urban or regional terrain of conflict (Kapur 2005: 107). The interface, she adds, is predominantly that of loss, of depletion of citizens’ rights. But she also emphasizes Kanwar’s (the citizen-artist’s) documentary practice as one that challenges and unmasks the late postmodern aesthetic of global negotiation, rescuing “a residual politics where artists, in their ambiguously positioned identity as citizen-subjects, take hold of fraught contemporaneity and dream a more democratic and just society” (107).

2. Violence or the Sacred

The dream of public protest is precisely that, residual. The right to occupy is a dream resembling the defiant gardens grown in war time on battlefields, mass graves or in internment camps. The violence of the state of emergency, under which people are forced to live today in many regions

of the world, presents numerous problems for documentary and performance practices precisely at the moment when we were made to believe in the changing landscape of perceptual and communicative experience, namely our bodily interfaces with the screens and networks of social media and (postgeographical) information connectivity. I want to continue to reflect on the notion of the state as a projective apparatus that, as we know more clearly after Snowdon's revelations about surveillance, data capture and the incursion of technology into every aspect of daily life, appears inevitably coercive and renders protests – or interventions in and through art – conspicuously underprivileged. The expression of discontent or protest (cf. the *indignados* in Spain, the Occupy movement) in democratic countries of the West tends to follow grassroots rituals that are carried out within a human rights and civil liberties framework; the green movement added a wider discourse on environmental and planetary survival but also found itself locked up against geopolitical interests of multinational corporations and, as security researchers and hackers tell us, a secret planetary-scale surveillance system. All bodies, if we think of physical projections (from private to public space) and individual or collective articulations of protest, are screened. Today's socially-mediated protests preempt the documentary politics (of testimony) written into Kanwar's projects described above. The performance of protest must seek to screen and disseminate itself with a focus on the future. It will have been its own testament of failure.

It was after the fall of the Berlin Wall during several visits to Ljubljana that I learned about the NSK (Neue Slowenische Kunst) organization and its proclamation that it was time for a new state, and in 1992 the NSK announced the formation of a State in Time which, instead of a territory, claimed the “status of its state to thinking, which alters its boundaries in accordance with the movements and changes of its symbolic and physical collective and body” (IRWIN 2014: 7). This status of thinking and conceptualizing a state in time seemed improbable, paradoxical. I felt drawn to exploring the context and background of this monumental gesture and found out that the NSK, since 1984 and under the then existing communist regime of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, had developed a collective conceptual (and anonymous) movement comprising a state-like organizational structure with several departments (artists from the band Laibach, IRWIN, the Theatre of the Sisters of Scipion Nasice, later renamed Noordung, along with the design group New Collectivism, a group of architects, and the Department of Pure and Applied Philosophy) that mimicked, or rather performed, the contours of a state organology taking up a real cultural-political space in the Slovene region. After the collapse of communism in the 1990s and the subsequent break up of Yugoslavia (with Slovenia achieving the status of an

independent state for the first time), the conditions for NSK to declare its own organism an autonomous authority or claim statehood as a conceptual social sculpture were fortuitous, and yet I thought of the formation of NSK State in Time (opening an NSK Embassy in Moscow in May 1992!) a completely mad strategy. The strategy seemed to work, more embassies were opened, and I did not hesitate to apply for citizenship when NSK began to issue passports in the 1990s and designate its own conceptual territory as an abstract, suprematist body and aesthetic construct. I am now a citizen of the NSK state in time, and need to prepare attending its Citizens' Congresses which started in 2010 (Berlin), organized by "delegates" from the NSK state themselves. I attended a small meeting in London in December 2014. We were 14 citizens in attendance.

NSK's retooling of symbolic markers, iconographies and references to totalitarian and religious art, folk art, pop art, punk and industrial music, and the use of Malevich's suprematist black cross as emblem of the NSK banner, all seemed to be incongruous yet had a striking imaginary appeal in the context of the (nationalist/ethnic) reorganization of post-Soviet and Yugoslav sovereign states attempting to legitimize themselves. As Avi Pitchon suggests in "The Eye of the State,"

NSK's absurd and contradictory combination of symbols indeed empties the existing ideological promise, exposes it as corrupt/decadent, or simply neutralizes it by the very use of mishmash; the paradoxical mix-up (remix, mashup, cover version) neutralizes the formula and the specific, momentary compound chosen by the existing order, but it does not neutralize the symbols themselves on which the compound is based. The symbols continue to emit the aura of the eternal flame, which cannot be dimmed or extinguished (Pitchon 2014: 75)(3)

Having attended Laibach concerts (the band was recently banned from performing in France due to pressure from antifascist groups), I was initially repelled by their cold strategy of staging "artifices" of totalitarian state power, obviously seeking to manipulate reactions of fascination and fear, seduction and repulsion in audiences. Using well-known, recognizable symbols to lure spectators into preconceived assumptions relating to such signs (found for example in Nazi art or in Stalinism, in mass nationalistic rallies, etc), Laibach's military clothing and their albums (e.g. *Death for Death*, *Buy Victory*, *Sympathy for the Devil*) often appeared deceptively aggressive and enigmatic, much as their pounding industrial techno sound emphasized automation and repetition, and their filmic projections displayed images of war and destruction on screens which had the symbol of NATO superimposed over the images (during the NATO tour). Performing in Sarajevo (a city besieged and devastated during the Balkan War), Laibach played its version of the war march, "Mars on River Drina," which thematizes the horrors of war ("Mars" denoting

both the god of war and “march”) and the manipulation of national memory and trauma for support of the military. The revulsion I felt changed when I realized that Laibach’s identification with ideological markers played with the “instrumentality of the state machine” (the title of an early album) and the reservoir of the mythic and the sacred, proposing ritualized performance to function as “exorcism,” and – stated in the same interview – as an “organized activity of intense agitation and permanent, systematic, propagandist and ideological offensive” (Laibach 1980-1990).

What is interesting for our exploration of politicized performance is Laibach’s coding of their bodies as inessential ciphers that can be dressed up in various *uniforms*. Compared to the shaven heads and military fatigues, their bare chests or brown shirts and black ties (during early tours, e.g. “Država”, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sRADA7fLVpQ>), their Jesus Christ Superstar tour featured more religious ritual iconography, with the lead singer donning a large cross necklace and a Christ-like appearance, and the female band members (Laibach considers the notion of “original” member obsolete and substitutes members regularly) covering versions of biblical personae and confessional anthems (e.g. “The Cross”). The performances mobilize core iconographies in ways that must clearly be considered dangerous in the context of today’s fanatical fundamentalisms, and the banning of a concert, after what happened in the Jihadist attack in Paris in early 2015 (against the satirical newspaper Charlie Hebdo), would be the least problem. The tactic of exposing a vacuum centered around flags, rituals and sacred icons may have reached a limit, as the privilege of our “vital being-there” (as Rosi Braidotti asks in her essay “Bio-Power and Necro-Politics,” wondering whether death is overrated) seems severely compromised.

3. Defiant Gestures

In conclusion, one must ask therefore what kind of limit has been reached in the gestures of iconic performance hinting at the disintegrating or revitalized instrumentality of the state: what have we learned from public protest or conceptual aesthetics that document, so to speak, the failed and paralysing duality of affirmation and opposition, integration into neoliberal capitalism/the racial state and activist negation? How do you negate the *Mortall God* to whom we should owe our peace and security? What can a “vital being-there,” laying the bodies on the line, provoke? What modus operandi, amongst body/performance artists who derived their deconstructive techniques

from the kind of self-harming or self-endangering practices that Marina Abramović deployed in early work (in Belgrade and during her performances with Ulay in the 1970s-1980s), might be left at the historical moment when *personal techniques* are made to look silly (as evidenced in the critical reaction to Abramović’s current healing installations).(4) Could one not imagine, if one were cynical enough, that global capitalism and neoliberal regimes welcome protest movements and incorporate (or even generate) the gestures of dissent into the continuing mass-mediated spectacle, while performers have almost run out of repertoires for resistance and dissent, or for *noise* and what Boyan Manchev envisions as the disorganization of the organology of anthropotechnics (2007: 157).

Manchev’s notion of anthropotechnics refers to the organic use of corporeal techniques (for example in playing a musical instrument or in dance). Obviously, his appreciation of *noise* now feels nostalgic, too, as we look back to the lovely times of guitar smashing and punk. I want to comment on two public performances of defiance that are neither healing nor subversive nor over-identified, yet demanding not just a Laibachian response claiming “resistance is futile.” They both occurred in Turkey during the Gezi Park protest demonstrations that began in late May 2013, when a wave of demonstrations initially contested the urban development plan for Istanbul’s Taksim Gezi Park, and civil unrest became sparked by outrage at the violent eviction of a sit-in at the park protesting the plan. Subsequently, supporting demonstrations took place across Turkey protesting a wide range of concerns, at the core of which were issues of freedom of the press, of expression, assembly, and the regime’s encroachment on Turkey’s secularism. With no centralized leadership other than a small assembly that organized the initial environmental protest, the actions could be compared to the Occupy movement, although the level of violence with which they met was much higher. Social media helped to disseminate the protests, not least because most of the Turkish media downplayed them in the early phase. (3.5 million of Turkey’s 80 million people are estimated to have taken an active part in almost 5000 demonstrations across Turkey connected with the original Gezi Park protest; 11 people were killed and more than 8000 were injured, many critically, according to Wikipedia.)

If we follow this outline, the pattern of protest and its repression by the military police resembles other public conflicts over spatial justice (and I experienced the sinister techniques of police kettling during student protests in London where I least expected them). What is remarkable in this instance is the diversity of dissent that united citizens from a broad spectrum, encompassing

both right- and left-wing individuals, and complaints ranged from the original local environmental concerns to other issues such as the authoritarianism of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's curb on alcohol, a recent dispute about kissing in public, and the war in Syria. The protesters also started to assume the names (calling themselves *çapulcu* – looters) that the Turkish Prime Minister used to insult them, and when I looked at films and photographs that protesters showed me, I noticed how the social choreographies of squatting and protesting involved two particular corporeal gestures that fascinated me: the dervish dance of a performer participating in the Gezi Park protests, and the action of the “Standing Man” protest on Taksim Square which began in the evening hours of June 17, 2013, the same day on which the government had announced a crackdown on demonstrations.



Whirling dervish dancer at Gezi Park protest in Istanbul, 2013. Framegrab from video.



Erdem Gündüz, “Standing Man” protest on Taksim Square as captured by Twitter/social media photo, June 17, 2013.

These opposing yet related gestures are powerful for two reasons; first, they were absolutely non-violent and evoked no visible threat to the authorities, and they did not even articulate a clear protest sign or message. The first (the dance) appears ludic and theatrical, as the dancer dressed in a sumptuous costume yet donned a gas mask during the whirling performance which was cheered and applauded by the audience that ringed the space of the performance in Gezi Park. The second is more complex, as the performance artist Erdem Gündüz placed himself on Taksim Square, simply standing still and facing the national flag and an image of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Turkey's founding father, with no explanation or announcement, and initially unnoticed, after the Square had been sealed off. He stood there stoically, hands in pockets. As we learnt afterwards, this very small but potent act of defiance magnetized others to join in his peaceful resistance. Slowly, his protest was disseminated via social media, spreading to other cities in a viral wave. This most quiet and unimposing image seemed to have struck a cord with sympathizers or spectators used to the violent images of stone-throwing “looters” battling police officers and tear gas.



“Standing Man” after being joined by other standing men and women, captured by Twitter/social media photo, Hashtag #Duranadam (Standing Man), June 17, 2013.

As the news spread, by 2 a.m, in the night at least 300 protesters stood by his side. The vigil continued until police arrived to break it up. Gündüz was escorted away from police by his friends; he later called himself “Nothing” in an interview with the BBC, and it was reported that his plan was to stay standing still there for a month, breaking every 24 hours for three hours' rest, while a friend took his place. A video that documented the action shows the police arriving and not knowing what to do, clumsily checking his backpack and finding nothing.

For those who remember the momentous events of 1989 (Tiananmen Square, Berlin Wall), the Standing Man echoes the incredulous action of a sole individual on Tiananmen Square facing a column of tanks and stopping their progress for a moment that was reported by CNN all over the world. The iconic image of the “Tank Man” was in fact featured at the *Experiments with Truth* exhibit I mentioned earlier (“Unidentified Man with Plastic Bag” was the title given to the clip), and watching the scene again made me wonder about the immense courage of such an act of civil disobedience in the face of sheer power. It is obvious, as bloggers such as Nilüfer Göle (a well known Turkish sociologist) have pointed out, that the Standing Man’s performance was poetic, offering a silent pose, a silent body-language, that opened itself out to many interpretations and

thus generated theories and actions without explaining itself. Passivity, non-action, suddenly became full of epic potential, and yet, obviously, it remained ineffective and futile unless we assume that people's imagination, about the (momentary) claiming of public space, can be triggered.

It is this interactive trigger that interests me, also in regard to the dervish dancer who apparently tapped into a sacred Sufi tradition of a dance (enacted most commonly by whirling dervishes of the Mevlevi order in Turkey, known to enact a formal ceremony called *Sema* that was at some point forbidden [by Atatürk] but after 1954 became allowed again and known as a tourist attraction). The dance, therefore, connotes a religious practice in a secular society now pressured to confront conflicting political imperatives shadowing all of the former "West," in fact spreading onto a transnational and intersocietal level, cutting across almost the entirety of the Muslim community, but also cutting down into individual countries, especially in Islamic Africa, and intimating a struggle between fundamentalist Salafis and tolerant Sufis (in Egypt, Libya, Mali, Somalia, Nigeria, Sudan and Ethiopia). When I watched the dance, I could not help imagining a tiny singular, but inadvertently global, costumed dancer evoking a mystic form of ecstatic movement intended to calm the waves and eschew violence, connecting the sacred (of the Sufi tradition) to the secular political (displaying the mask to protect against tear gas). Recognition of the ecstatic trance dance of Sufism will be divided and complicated by the fact that a religious and secular understanding of the dance will not stop short of diverse interpretations, namely that Sufism is renowned primarily for its achievements in the fields of poetry and mysticism (its popular image in the West is that of an inner spiritual quest that avoids external action), while on the other hand the Sufi tariqa, or brotherhood, tends to entertain links spanning quietist sects to militant splinter groups and current Islamic fundamentalism and Jihadism.

The dance, in other words, is effective as an ambivalent symbol – another enigma. Its spinning movement hovers, so to speak, on one place but appears to transcend the moment, transcendentally relentless, inscribing a fluid vitality of contradictory motion at the heart of the power mechanisms and spatial politics of the state. The sacred/secular motion does not represent anything but a tremulous poetic image that resonates for a short while. And this is the sad aspect of any utopian "state in time" – it will lend itself, just as the "Umbrella Man" during the recent Hong Kong protests, to be recuperated and displayed, in the next art exhibition, as a kind of "disobedient object"(5) with a short artificial life, when in fact its movement was not disobeying at all. It was a motion – or a stilling – of limbs, but it circled Gandhi's question about how to

seize a moment of truth to arm oneself against the truth.

Notes

(1) See the editors' introduction to this anthology. Achille Mbembe's essay on "Necropolitics" (2003) is credited with having shifted Foucault's analysis of biopower, sovereignty, and the control society to more current concerns with terror, in-security and globalization, in an era that may be witnessing an unprecedented form of biopolitical governmentality in which "necropower," or the technologies of control through which life is strategically subjugated to the power of death, largely operates with and alongside technologies of discipline. This power of death, under manifestations and proclamations of (seemingly endless) states of terror, also accounts for an increasingly authoritarian politics governing through economic, rather than social terms. My interest in *spatial justice* was partly motivated by the release of Andreas Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos' new book (2015) and by conversations with the author after his recent visit to Jerusalem and Gaza.

(2) Kanwar's film cannot be accessed online, but I found a video clip that shows the same bizarre and spectacularized border dance: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TAx5LIPDcbM>. In early November 2014, the media reported that a suicide bomber blew himself up on the Pakistani side, claiming the lives of at least 61 people including 11 women and three security personnel. More than 200 people were also injured. The Al-Qaeda affiliated militant group Jandullah claimed the responsibility for the attack.

(3) Slavoj Žižek, Eda Čufer, Marina Gržinić and others have commented on both on the syntax of NSK's retro-principles and the strategy of "over-identification" with the aesthetic, ritualistic, gestural and symbolic features of states, or the "political theology" (Carl Schmitt's term) of capital and coercive power. Monroe's book-length study (2005) of NSK's and Laibach's works as nomadic *interrogation machines*, now been expanded and reissued in German and French translations, details the replica tactics, for example the performance of the *NSK Guards* project involving photographic documentation (along with the opening of embassies) of rituals during which soldiers of various armies wear armbands bearing Malevich's black cross, and stand to attention at the foot of the NSK flag. Many of these absurd rituals are photographically captured and displayed in IRWIN's *State in Time* book.

(4) Numerous scathing reviews of Abramović's installations after her durational MoMA event in 2010, *The Artist is Present*, including *512 Hours* (London, 2014) and *Generator* (New York, 2014) have appeared in the media. See, for example, Jerry Saltz, "Marina Abramović Is Still in the Dark," <http://www.vulture.com/2014/10/marina-abramovic-is-still-in-the-dark.html>, or Ken Johnson's review in the *New York Times*, November 6, 2014.

(5) Quoting enthusiastic art dealers in Hong Kong who thought the "Umbrella Revolution" turned the entire city into a work of art, Barbara Pollack comments on the "Umbrella Man," a 12-foot tall statue of a precariously positioned figure made of wood slats holding a bright yellow umbrella in the outstretched hand, which had been hauled by a student (who calls himself "Milk" to protect

his identity) into the protest area and set up across from government offices. (Pollack 2015: 46). The motif (umbrellas used by protesters to protect themselves against police attacks with pepper spray) soon turned up all over the streets of Hong Kong, and Pollack notes that such objects from protests have now been added to the current *Disobedient Objects* exhibit at the Victoria and Albert Museum. Replicas of some the disobedient objects (ceramic mugs, bracelets, “exclusive jewellery”, etc.) can be purchased at the V&A Shop (<http://www.vandashop.com/Disobedient-Objects-Exhibition/b/4930353031>)

References

- Braidotti, Rosi (2007), “Biomacht und Nekro-Politik. Überlegungen zu einer Ethik der Nachhaltigkeit”, *Springerin, Hefte fur Gegenwartskunst*, 13:2, pp. 18-23
- Giroux, Henry A. (2006), “Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, Class, and the Biopolitics of Disposability.” *College Literature*, 33(3), 171-196.
- Helfenstein, Josef and Newland, Joseph, eds. (2014), *Experiments with Truth: Gandhi and Images of Nonviolence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.
- Hobbes, Thomas (1991), *Leviathan*, ed. R. Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- IRWIN, ed. (2014), *State in Time*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia/Minor Compositions.
- Kapur, Geeta (2005), “Tracking Images,” in Mark Nash, ed. *Experiments with Truth*. Philadelphia: The Fabric Workshop and Museum, pp. 105-11.
- Laibach (1980-90), “Interviews,” at <http://www.laibach.org/interviews>
- Manchev, Boyan (2007), “Noise : l’organologie désorganisée,” *Multitudes* 28, 157-165.
- Mbembe, Achille (2003), “Necropolitics,” trans. Libby Meintjes, *Public Culture* 15:1, 11-40.
- Monroe, Alexei (2005), *Interrogation Machine: Laibach and NSK*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Nash, Mark, ed. (2005), *Experiments with Truth*. Philadelphia: The Fabric Workshop and Museum.
- Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos, Andreas (2015), *Spatial Justice: Body, Lawscape, Atmosphere*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Pitchon, Avi (2014), “The Eye of the State,” in IRWIN, ed. *State in Time*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia/Minor Compositions, pp. 71-78.
- Pollack, Barbara (2015), “Amazing Hong Kong,” *Artnews*, January 2015, 44-52.