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Commonist Red Art: Blood, Bones, Utopia and Kittens

Does Red Art exist? And if so, who creates it and where can we find it? This special issue of the Leonardo Electronic Almanac addresses these questions and collates a series of perspectives and visual essays that analyze the role, if any, that Red Art plays in the contemporary art world.

Red Art, these are two simple words that can generate complex discussions and verbal feuds since they align the artist to a vision of the world that is ‘Red’ or ‘Communist.’

Nevertheless, even if the two little words when placed together are controversial and filled with animus, they are necessary, if not indispensable, to understand contemporary aesthetic issues that are affecting art and how art operates in the context of social versus political power relations within an increasingly technological and socially-mediated world.

Red Art could be translated – within the contemporary hierarchical structures – as the art of the powerless versus the art of the powerful, as the art of the masses versus the art of the few, as the art of the young versus the old, as the art of the technological democrats versus the technological conservatives, as the art of the poor versus the art of the rich. Or it could be described as the art of the revolutionary versus the status quo. In the multitude of the various possible definitions, one appears to stand out for contemporary art and it is the definition of art as bottom-up participation versus art as top-down prepackaged aesthetic knowledge. And yet, what does Red Art stand for and can it be only restricted to Commonist Art?

The contemporary meaning of Red Art is different from what it may have been for example in Italy in the 1970s, since so much has changed in terms of politics, ideology and technology. It is no longer possible to directly identify Red Art with Commonist Art (as the art of the ex Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or of its satellite states and globalized Communist political parties which were and continue to be present in the West – albeit in edulcorated forms) nor as the art of the left, but there is a need to analyze the complexity of the diversification and otherization of multiple geopolitical perspectives.

If today’s Red Art has to redefine its structures and constructs, it becomes necessary to understand who is encompassed within the label of Red Artists and what their common characteristics are. Red Artists – if we wanted to use this category – and their aesthetic production cannot be reduced to the word ‘Communist,’ borrowing passed ideological constructs. An alternative to the impasse and the ideological collapse of communism is the redefinition of Red Art as the art of the commons: Commonist Art. If Red Art were to be defined as the art of the commons, Commonist Art, thereby entrenching it clearly within technoutopias and neoliberalist crowd sourcing approaches for collective participation, this would provide a contradictory but functional framework for the realization of common practices, socially engaged frameworks, short term goals and ‘loose/open’ commitments that could be defined in technological terms as liquid digital utopias or as a new form of permanent dystopia.

The XXIst century appears to be presenting us, then, with the entrenched digitized construct of the common versus the idea of the Paris Commune of 1871, thereby offering a new interpretation of the social space and an alternative to traditional leftist/neoliberal constructs. The idea of the common – as an open access revolving door, is opposed to the concept of the commune – as a highly regulated and hierarchical structure.

The ‘semantic’ distinguishes between commons and communes becomes important since both terms are reflections of constructions and terminological frameworks for an understanding of both society and art that is based on ‘likes,’ actions and commitments for a common or a commune. The commitment, even when disparagingly used to define some of the participants as click-activists and armchair revolutionaries, is partial and leaves the subject able to express other likes often in contradiction with one another: e.g. I like the protests against Berlusconi’s government and I like the programs on his private TV.

I find the idea of the commons (knowledge, art, creativity, health and education) liberating, empowering and revolutionary, if only it was not expressed within its own economic corporate structures, creating further layers of contradiction and operational complexities.

The contradictions of contemporary Red Art and contemporary social interactions may be located in the difference between the interpretations of common and commune – the commune upon which the Italian Communist Party, for example, based its foundations in order to build a new ‘church.’

The relationships in the commune of the Italian communists (asymptomatically defined as Cattocommunist or Catholic-communist) rests in faith and in compelled actions, in beliefs so rooted that are as blinding as blindness is the light of God in the painting The Conversion of Saint Paul on the Road to Damascus by Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio.

{[...]} and from the leadership an aggressive unwillingness to allow any dissent or deviation. ‘That time produced one of the sharpest mental frosts I can remember on the Left,’ the historian E. P. Thompson would recall from personal knowledge of the CP. [...]

It is this blind faith that has generated the martyrs of communism and heretical intellectuals, accusations from which not even Antonio Gramsci was able to escape. The vertical hierarchical structure of the commune and of the Communist Party produced heretics and impositions, but also supported artists, intellectuals, academics and writers that operated consonantly with the party’s ideals: people that sang from the same preapproved institutional hymn sheet.

Stefania: This young generation horrifies me. Having been kept for years by this state, as soon as they discover to have two neurons they pack and go to study, to work in the US and London, without giving a damn for who supported them. Oh well, they do not have any civic vocation. When I was young at the occupied faculty of literature, I oozed civic vocation. [...], I have written eleven novels on civic duty and the book on the official history of the Party.

Jep Gambardella: How many certainties you have, Stefania. I do not know if I envy you or feel a sensation of disgust. [...] Nobody remembers your civic vocation during your University years. Many instead
 remember, personally, another vocation of yours that was expressed at the time; but was consumed in the bathrooms of the University. You have written the official history of the Party because for years you have been the mistress of the head of the Party. Your eleven novels published by a small publishing house kept by the Party and reviewed by small newspapers close to the Party are irrelevant novels [...] the education of the children that you conduct with sacrifice every minute of your life [...] Your children are always without you [...] then you have – to be precise – a butler, a waiter, a cook, a driver that accompanies the boys to school three babysitters. In short, how and when is your sacrifice manifested? [...] These are your lies and your frailties.

To the question, then, if Red Art exists I would have to answer: YES! I have seen Red Art in Italy (as well as abroad), as the Communist Art produced in the name of the party, with party money and for party propaganda, not at all different from the same art produced in the name of right-wing parties with state or corporate money – having both adopted and co-opted the same systems and frameworks of malfeasance shared by sycophantic artists and intellectuals.

In order to understand the misery of this kind of Red Art one would have to look at the Italian aesthetization of failure – which successfully celebrates failure in the Great Beauty by Paolo Sorrentino when the character of Stefania, and her ‘oozing civic duty,’ is ripped apart. It is a civic responsibility that is deprived and devoid of any ethics and morals.

This is but one of the multiple meanings of the concept of Red Art – the definition of Red Art as Communist Art, is the one that can only lead to sterile definitions and autocelebratory constructs based on the ‘aesthetic obfuscation of the lack of meaning’ as a tool for the obscurity of the aesthetic to act as a producer of meaning when the artist producing it is inept at creating meaning. Even more tragically, Red Art leads to the molding of the artist as spokesperson of the party and to the reduction of the artwork, whenever successful, to advertising and propaganda.

Commonist Art, founded on the whim of the ‘like’ and ‘trend,’ on the common that springs from the aggregation around an image, a phrase, a meme or a video, is able to construct something different, a convergence of opinions and actions that can be counted and weighed and that cannot be taken for granted. Could this be a Gramscian utopia of re-construction and re-fashioning of aesthetics according to ‘lower commons’ instead of high and rich ‘exclusivity,’ which as such is unattainable and can only be celebrated through diamond skulls and gold toilets?

Commonist Art – the art that emerges from a common – is a celebration of a personal judgment, partially knowledgeable and mostly instinctive, perhaps manipulated – since every ‘other’ opinion is either manipulated by the media or the result of international lobby’s conspiracies or it can be no more than a reinforcement of the society of the simulacra. Conversely, it may also be that the image and its dissemination online is the representation of a personal difference towards systems of hierarchical power and endorsement that can only support ‘their own images and meanings’ in opposition to images that are consumed and exhausted through infinite possibilities of interpretation and re-dissemination.

If Commonist Art offers the most populist minimum common denominator in an evolutionary framework determined by whims, it is not at all different from the minimum common denominator of inspirational/aspirational codified aesthetics that are defined by the higher echelons of contemporary oligarchies that have increasingly blurred the boundaries of financial and aesthetic realms.

Commonist Art – if the current trends of protest will continue to affirm themselves even more strongly – will continue to defy power and will increasingly seek within global trends and its own common base viable operational structures that hierarchies will have to recognize, at one point or the other, by subsuming Commonist Art within pre-approved structures.

Red Art, therefore, if intended as Commonist Art becomes the sign of public revolts, in the physical squares or on the Internet. It is art that emerges without institutional ‘approval’ and in some cases in spite of institutional obstacles. Gramsci would perhaps say that Commonist Art is a redefinition of symbolic culture, folk art and traditional imageries that processed and blended through digital media and disseminated via the Internet enable Red Art to build up its own languages and its own aesthetics without having to be institutionally re-processed and receive hierarchical stamps of approval.

Red Art can also be the expression of people whose blood and tears – literally – mark the post-democracies of the first part of the XXIst century. Non-political, non-party, non-believers, the crowds of the Internet rally around an argument, a sense of justice, a feeling of the future not dominated by carcinogenic politicians, intellectuals and curators, that present themselves every time, according to geographical and cultural spaces, as Sultans, Envoys of God, or even Gods.

Red Art, the Communist Art that perhaps is worth considering as art, is the one that is self-elevated, built on the blood and bones of people still fighting in the XXIst century for justice, freedom and for a piece of bread. Art that rallies crowds’ likes and dislikes based on the whims of a liquid Internet structure where people support within their timelines an idea, a utopia, a dream or the image of a kitten.

This piece of writing and this whole volume is dedicated to the victims of the economic and political violence since the beginning of the Great Recession and to my father; and to the hope, hard to die off, that some utopia may still be possible.
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siveness of neoliberalism during the same period. Distribution – not to mention, equal distribution – could have enjoyed a much more prominent role as a natural fundament of the Web and, accordingly, as a contributing factor in any investigation of digital art. Last but definitely not least, one cannot ignore the crucial fact that apolitical art is much easier to enter the art market and play the ‘game’ of institutionalization (and vice versa).

To the question: could the Internet and new media at large become true ‘game changers’ in the current historical conjuncture? What does ‘red art’ have to propose, and how does it relate to the previously described ‘post-internet condition’?

Interestingly, the term “post-internet art” was born and grew parallel to the global economic crisis and the Great Recession of 2009. One the most important objectives of the social movements that were engendered by the crisis has been the effort to “reclaim” and “re-appropriate.” This aspiration referred not only to economic resources, but also to social roles, democratic functions, human rights, and – of course – urban spaces. Syntagma Square in Greece, Puerta del Sol in Madrid, Zuccotti Park in New York, as well as some of the most iconic public locations around the world saw diverse, or even ‘irreconcilable’ in some cases crowds demand change. Within the reality of Data Capitalism and its multiple self-generated crises, people increasingly felt that they have now been totally deprived of a place (“topos” in Greek).

It is worth remembering that the coiner of “utopia,” Thomas More, chose an island as the location where he placed his ideal society. Any island constitutes a geographic formation that privileges the development of individual traits through a natural process of ‘appropriation.’ This encompasses both the material and the immaterial environment as expressed in the landscape, the biology of the different organisms, and – most relevant to our case – culture. Notably, when it comes to connecting utopianism with the cultural paradigm of new media art, we should not focus merely on the lack of a physical space (as articulated, for instance, through cyberspace); rather, we should address the juxtaposition of ‘topos’ with a potentially ‘empty’ notion of ‘space.’ The transcendence of space in a ‘digital utopia’ absolutely necessitates the existence of a ‘topos.’ In a similar way to the one that Marx sees capital as a stage towards a superior system of production (communism), the construction of a ‘topos’ is a prerequisite for the flourishing of utopianism.

‘Red Art’ can be understood as a tool for the creation of such ‘topoi.’ The lesson that new media artists can learn from the political osmoses catalyzed by the economic crisis is that, in order to be effective, cyberspace should become part of a strategy that combines physical and online spaces, practically and conceptually, whilst taking into account the individual traits of both. The necessity expressed through this combination constitutes (at least partly) a departure from the developing discourses around the ‘Internet of Things’ or the ‘Internet of Places.’ Alternatively, or additionally, what is proposed here is the formulation of an ‘Internet of Praxis’ (including, of course, artistic praxis). This approach is vividly reflected in several of the projects examined in this publication, as well as in the theoretical frameworks that are outlined.

Digital art is today in a position to capitalize on the participatory potentialities that have been revealed by the socio-political events that defined the early 2010s. The reconceptualization of cyberspace as a ‘cybertopos’ is a constituent part of this new ground on which people are called to stand and build. Accordingly, the emergence of a culture of ‘post-net participation’ in which digital media transcend physical space by consolidating it (instead of ‘merely’ augmenting it), may allow us to explore “concrete utopias” to a greater extent than ever before in recent times. It is by actively pursuing this objective that we would expect to change the rules of the game. Artists are often the first to try.

Bill Balaskas
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1. The term ‘post-internet art’ is attributed to artist Marisa Olson. See Gene McHugh, Post Internet (Brescia: LINK Editions), 5.
3. Gene McHugh, Post Internet, 6.
4. The etymological comparison between the terms ‘post-internet art’ and ‘postmodern art’ could also highlight this context. Notably, in the case of this juxtaposition, ‘post-internet art’ puts a tool (the Internet) in the position of a movement (Modernism). If we were to consider the Internet as a movement, then, the natural historical link that would be established through the term ‘post-internet art’ would be with net art. Nevertheless, such a decision would assign net art to a status of ‘legitimation,’ towards which major museums, curators and art fairs have shown a rather consistent hostility. In this instance, historicization becomes a fœ, since it would refute a ‘neutral’ relationship of the Web with art. This perspective is closely connected with the formulation of an abstract notion of universalism, to which I refer further down (see endnote 8).
5. Thomas More’s Utopia was first published in 1516, in Belgium. There are several translations of the book.
8. For more on the concept of ‘concrete utopias’ see Ernst Bloch, The Principle of Hope, tr. Neville Plak, Stephen Place, and Paul Knight, 3 vols (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986). Bloch differentiates between ‘abstract utopias’ and ‘concrete utopias,’ associating the latter with the possibility of producing real change in the present. ‘Concrete utopias’ should not be confused with seemingly similar theorizations, such as Nicolas Bourriaud’s ‘microtopias,’ which structurally aim at preserving the existing status quo.

Bill Balaskas
Suggestions for Art That Could Be Called Red

What is Red Art? Or rather: what could Red Art be in today’s post-communist, post-utopian world, a world shaken by conflicts engendered by contrary beliefs and ideologies which have little to do with communism? A world in which countries and societies are disrupted by territorial disputes, and by bloody fights about questions of religious identity, national identity, and ideology? Where communism has been overrun by capitalism with rare exception, where the European left movement is weak. Where the post-industrial era has produced an economic reality that is orders of magnitude more complex, transnational and therefore more difficult to control or change, than history has ever seen. In this situation, can there (still) be art that deals with ideas of communism constructively, or does contemporary art look at communist ideals only with nostalgia?

And let’s be clear: is art that simply speaks out against capitalism, globalization and neo-liberalism from a leftist position – is this kind of art ‘red’ per se? Do we expect Red Art to be ‘red’ in content, for instance, in directly addressing topics such as class struggle, the negatives of capitalism and a new neo-liberal world order? And if it does, is it enough to be descriptive or do we want art to be more than that, i.e., provoking, forward-thinking or even militant? In 1970, Jean-Luc Godard drafted a 39-point manifesto Que faire? What is to be done? that contrasted the antagonistic practices of making political films and making films ‘politically.’ It called unequivocally for art that actively takes up the position of the proletarian class and that aims for nothing less than the transformation of the world. With his legacy, what kind of objectives do we request from Red Art? Do we really still think that art can change the world or is that another idea from the past that has been overwritten by something that we like to call reality? Can art that is for the most part commercialised and produced in a capitalist art market be ‘red’ at all, or does it have to reject the system established by galleries, fairs and museums in order to be truly ‘red’?

Decades ago, when artists started to use new media such as video and the computer, their works were ‘new’ in the way they were produced and distributed, and changed the relationship between artists and their collaborators as well as between the artworks and their audiences and ‘users’ respectively. Most of this new-media-based art circulated outside the ordinary market and found other distribution channels. The majority of works were inspired by a quest for the ‘new’ and consistently broke with old aesthetic principles and functions. Much of it was also driven by a search for the ‘better,’ by overthrowing old hierarchies and introducing a more liberal and inclusive concept of the world, based on self-determination and active participation. Last but not least the emergence of the Internet brought us a fertile time for new and revisited utopias and artistic experiments dealing with collaboration, distribution of knowledge, shared authorship, and appropriation of technologies. Today we know that neither the Internet nor any other new technology has saved us, but that the hopes for a more democratic world and alternative economies sparked by it have come true, if only to a minor degree.

So how do artists respond to this post-communist, post-utopian condition? What can be discussed as Red Art in the recent past and present? In this issue of Leonardo we have gathered some answers to these questions in the form of papers, essays and artworks, the latter produced especially for this purpose. Bringing together and editing this issue was challenging because we decided from the start to keep the call for contributions as open as possible and to not pre-define too much. We were interested in what kind of responses our call would produce at a moment when the world is occupied with other, seemingly hotter topics, and it is fascinating to note that the resulting edition quite naturally spans decades of art production and the respective ‘new’ technologies as they related to ideas of social equality and empowerment – from video art to net art to bio art. This issue shows that the search for alternative ideas and perspectives, and an adherence to leftist ideals is neither futile nor simply nostalgic. But that this search is ever more relevant, particularly at a time when European politics is seemingly consolidating and wars around the world are establishing new regimes of social and economic inequality.

Susanne Jaschko
Why Digital Art is Red

The divide between the art shown in major museums and art fairs that associated with the new media scene has been deep and durable. Many critics have puzzled over it, particularly because there is much that the two realms share, including the desire to put people into unusual social situations. Yet some of the reasons for the divide are plain enough, and they are about money, power and social distinction. The economic divide is across competing models of capitalist activity: the exclusive ownership of objects set against the release of reproducible symbols into networks with the ambition that they achieve maximum speed and ubiquity of circulation. The social divide is between a conservative club of super-rich collectors and patrons, and their attendant advisors, who buy their way into what they like to think of as a sophisticated cultural scene (Duchamp Land), against a realm which is closer to the mundane and more anonymous producers offer up temporary creations to put people into unusual social situations.

This description of the divide has been put in extreme terms for the sake of clarity, and there are a few instances of the split appearing to erode. Yet its persistence remains one of the most striking features of the general fragmentation of the fast-growing and globalising art world. That persistence rests on solid material grounds, laid out by Marx: the clash of economic models is a clear case of the mode and relations of production coming into conflict, and is part of a much wider conflict over the legal, political and social aspects of digital culture, and its synthesis of production and reproduction. Copyright is one arena where the clash is very clear. Think of the efforts of museums to control the circulation of images and to levy copyright charges, while at the same time surrendering to the camera-phone as they abandon the attempt to forbid photography in their galleries.

So where is Red Art and the left in this scenario? Amidst the general gloom and lassitude that has beset the art world in recent years, it has been suggested that the red has been tamed by tourism, the kitsch, and that the left has been driven out of the scene by the decline of the art world itself becomes more exposed to social media, and is ever less able to protect its exclusive domain.

Thirty years ago, to find out what was happening in Gaza, you would have to have had a decent short-wave radio, a fax machine, or access to those great newsstands in Times Square and North Hollywood that carried the world’s press. Not anymore. We can get a news story from . . . Gaza or Ramallah or Qassara or Vidarbha and have it out to a world audience in a matter of hours.

It is hard to ban social media, it has been claimed, because it entwines video fads, kittens and politics (and banning kittens looks bad). So the insight attributed by some to Lenin – that capitalists will sell us the rope with which to hang them – is still relevant.

In an era in which the political and artistic avant-gardes have faded, the affiliation of the art world that is founded upon the sale and display of rare and unique objects made by a few exceptional individuals has been driven by monopoly rent effects – tends to be with the conspicuous consumption of the state and the super-rich. Here, the slightest taint of the common desktop environment is enough to kill aesthetic feeling. The affiliation of at least some of new media art is rather to the kitsch, the populist, and to the egalitarian circulation of images and words, along with discourse and interaction. New media artists who push those attachments work against some of the deepest seated elements of the art world ethos: individualism, distinction, discreetness and preservation for posterity (and long-term investment value). It should be no surprise that they are frequently and without qualification denied the status of ‘artist’.

It is also clear why the death of leftist ideas in elite discourse does not hold in new media circles, where the revival of thinking about the Left, Marxism and Communism is very evident. The borders of art are blurred by putting works to explicit political use (in violation of the Kantian imperative still policed in the mainstream art world). Very large numbers of people are continually making cultural interventions online, and value lies not in any particular exceptional work but in the massive flow of interaction and exchange. In that world, as it never could in a gallery, the thought may creep in that there is nothing special about any one of us. And this may lead to the greatest scandal of all: the think of the statements that artists who deal with politics in the mainstream art world are obliged to make as their ticket of admission – ‘my art has no political effect.’ They have to say it, even when it is piously absurd; and they have to say it, even as the art world itself becomes more exposed to social media, and ever less able to protect its exclusive domain and regulate the effects of its displays. So at base, the divide is economic, but at the level of what causes the repulsion from digital art – that puts collectors and critics to flight – it is deeply and incontrovertibly political.

They run headlong from the red.

Julian Stallabrass
INTRODUCTION
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WHEN AESTHETIC IS NOT JUST A PRETTY PICTURE
Paolo Cirio’s Social Actions

by

Lanfranco Aceti

As a general rule, it is taxation that monetarizes the economy: it is taxation that creates money, and it necessarily creates it in motion, in circulation, with turnover, and also in a correspondence with services and goods in the current of that circulation. 1

Decoding the Flow is an exhibition by Paolo Cirio with the Museum of Contemporary Cuts (MoCC) that opened in parallel with another exhibition by Cirio at Kasa Gallery that was titled Jurisdiction Shopping.

Loophole4All, the artwork shown in these two exhibitions, was a data-based critique of capitalism rendered through a series of disruptive interventions, which provided the opportunity to refocus one’s attention on the operational systems of contemporary Data Capitalism.

Cirio’s realm of artistic activities is based on a critique of contemporary society that touches and rattles, as much as an artwork can, the smooth operations of international corporations.

How could we define the activities of an artist like Cirio and should we neatly frame his works of art? It is too easy and restrictive to place both, artist and works of art, within a new media context, since they do not ‘live’ solely online, but are a composite of different experiences, performances, processes and practices.

When developing these two exhibitions, Decoding the Flow and Jurisdiction Shopping, as a curator, I was in the midst of elaborating and reflecting on a series of critiques of the contemporary art world and its patrons – corporate tycoons who still see an artwork as a pretty picture, monetizing galleries that sought the next great cash cow (read: artist), or academic environments that promote obscurantist aesthetics and exsanguinated esotericisms.

Loophole4All represented a valid alternative to the ‘usual requirements’ of aesthetic conformity and offered a moment of reflection on the conditions of illegality within which the increasingly powerless majority of people (99%) are obliged to live in.

Cirio’s Jurisdiction Shopping was focused on the current schizophrenic post-postmodern relationships between state, corporations and citizens. The exhibition analyzed the process of personification of corporations and their increasingly transnational nature, which have produced a new set of relationships that exclude and exempt some people from participation in the shared onus (responsibility) towards the state. It focused on the processes that allowed and still allow the privileged few to continue operating illegally within the state; living, abusing and corrupting through financial malpractices the very society within which they live.

Cirio’s artwork, Loophole4All, democratized the process of escaping from one’s obligations towards the state by allowing a liberalized and widespread participation in the process of tax evasion – no longer a privilege of the ‘rich few.’

Jurisdiction Shopping offered the viewer the possibility of engaging with a series of works of art that are based on the artist’s experience of attempting to democratize practices of illegality, thus presenting...
the possibility of a world within which frameworks for a generalized tax evasion exist and, accordingly, the tools to replicate billionaires’ behaviors are readily available.

In a historical period in which social injustice, illegal market and financial behaviors, corporate maleficesance, as well as multiple obscure and hidden charges have become a form of private taxation and vexation parallel to the public taxations and vexations of corrupt states, Loophole4All presented itself as the ultimate mass participation in the phantasmagoric and elusive corporate world of billionaires.

‘Everyone could set a corporation in a tax haven = everyone could become a tax evader’ becomes the aesthetic mantra; the equation that attempts to dissolve the differences between the enlarging underclass of have-nots (99%) and the minute club of haves (1%).

These were and still are the phenomena that contribute to the creation of large underclasses within Europe and North America. In this context, it is important to understand Cirio’s artistic vision as one that presented mass tax evasion as the new great social equalizer and elusive corporate world of billionaires.

The exhibition and its works of art poke fun directly at the failure of the state in reshaping itself into a new corporate and economic identity, as well as the failure of the social body to understand that the new corporate mythology and its systems are, in Deleuzian terms, part of the same old apparatus of capture and extortion. Both the state and the social body have been captured and are being squeezed from the corporate global economics, which were presented as the saving grace of a concept of society that had been declared dead in the 1980s, and that now certainly no longer exists.

**DECODING THE FLOW OF MEANING**

Closely linked with deterritorialization and reterritorialization are the parallel terms “decoding” and “recoding,” which bear on representations rather than on concrete objects. Decoding, it is important to note, [...] refers to a process of dis-investing given meanings altogether, to a process of “uncoding,” [...] ultimately the elimination of established codes that confer fixed meaning.

The elimination of fixed meanings eliminates value and generates a flow that can be orchestrated, manipu-
lated, structured and directed according to specific and particular interests within a capitalistic society that exists and prospers on the lack of meaning. Here, perhaps, in Deleuzian terms, the difference between the representation and the action is displayed through Cirio’s aesthetic approach, in his request to the audience of actively understanding how something works and in taking an action.

Let us recall that “decoding” does not signify the state of a flow whose code is understood (compris) (deciphered, translatable, assimilable), but, in a more radical sense, the state of a flow that is no longer contained in (compris dans) its own code, that escapes its own code.  

Decoding The Flow on the online platform of the Museum of Contemporary Cuts was a necessary counterpoint to the physical exhibition that took place simultaneously at Kasa Gallery. Decoding The Flow was an artistic and curatorial statement that created a flow of images and “code, that escapes its own code” by presenting a survey of Cirio’s aesthetic and artistic practice.

Starting from the latest of Cirio’s works of art, Loophole4All, MoCC presented a series of images with the clear understanding that this could only be an attempt to decode the financial and social crisis, as well as represent the larger social issues that characterized the last part of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century. The exhibition wanted to direct the gaze of the viewer to the loss of meaning of both state and citizen in a world where corporations were and are re-shaping in capitalistic terms not just their own existence but the ‘lack’ of meaning and conditions for everyone else within it.


Loophole4All, Paolo Cirio, 2013. Courtesy of the artist. Used with permission.
The following were the questions that arose and became part of the curatorial statement for the exhibition:

In a world of corporations is there any role left for the individual? What are the future implications of the current processes of exploitation, commodification and enslavement of the individual to supranational economic entities? Are there processes that would allow extended forms of community and citizenship to unveil and alter the power relationships between the post-citizens, the post-state and the omnivorous corporations? In order to reconsider these power relationships, what alternatives and constructive frameworks can be offered by contemporary aesthetic and artistic practices?

Cirio’s works of art have attempted, over the years, to respond to these questions and have received critical acclaim and attention from the press, as well as raised ‘corporate eyebrows’ that have lead to legal actions and controversies.

Such controversies are embedded in the capitalistic process of decoding, whereby aesthetic analyses in this particular context of disproportionate power relationships can make of the artist an embodied mythological representation – but also the embodiment of an action for a struggle that increasingly sees the concept of citizenship reduced to a condition of slavery. This condition is systematically imposed by a widespread corporate perception of economic power that is endorsed and supported by a skewed understanding of statehood and democracy.
It is for this possibility of the action – more than the representation – that the aesthetic practice of Cirio suggested and continues to suggest peaceful methodologies of re-appropriation of civic forms of shared participation and civility, which may still be possible to salvage from what Adorno defined as the “age of total neutralization,” and within which Cirio, as an artist, does not seek any false and easy reconciliations.

It is the action that still suggests a meaning, and not vice-versa, in a capitalistic society of simulacral representation that produces and proceeds from the elimination of meaning to the elimination of action.

The Museum of Contemporary Cuts disseminated every day, for the entire duration of the show, one image of the exhibition *Decoding the Flow* on its electronic platforms, creating an accretion of content, a flow, a structure to which meaning could be attributed through decoding, coding, uncoding and re-coding. The meaning was and remains that of an action, an event, an exhibition that happened in spite of and despite cultural frameworks and corporate structures.

**THE CONCLUSION OF AN EXPERIENCE**

The exhibition *Decoding the Flow* at the Museum of Contemporary Cuts complemented and enriched the physical exhibition *Jurisdiction Shopping* at Kasa Gallery, and confirmed with this publication the importance of ‘another’ discourse in the fine arts. These are aesthetic discourses that should be outside corporate agendas and exist beyond the requests of exhibiting ‘names.’

The two exhibitions were successful in as much as they were ‘actions’ and provided meaningful experiences upon which to reflect, both in curatorial and aesthetic terms.

In this context, my curatorial action was that of enforcing an agenda that ignored and defied requests to present not innovative works, but the true and tried and tired, replicating a circuit of names and artistic practices that left little to the imagination.
It seems at times a pointless exercise to present the same works of art that have no contribution to make, that have been cannibalized, chewed to smithereens and spat out as pulp not by the artist in an act of defiance – as in the case of Art and Culture aka Still and Chew by John Latham – but by the corporate and marketing promotional tools of ‘high art.’ Particularly, if nothing is added, nothing else is constructed, nothing is destroyed and no other thought is sedimented upon the building blocks of history of art, what is the value (excluding monetary compensations) of reveling yet again in the same trite aesthetics?

Paolo Cirio’s two exhibitions fall in this unusual convergence of digital and physical space, of action and representation, of literal and obscure, simple and complex. Loophole4All was and is an artwork able to instigate reactions and actions and not just representations. The reterritorialization of meaning in a new utopian society – devoid of capitalism – may as well come through an artwork that advocates for democratic tax evasion.
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