UNIVERSITY OF ARTS IN BELGRADE

FACULTY OF DRAMATIC ARTS
THEATRE, FILM, RADIO AND TV

Theory of institutions and cultural policies for contemporary performative practices – Институционална теорија и културна политика у савременој перформативној пракси

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

CANDIDATE
Biljana Tanurovska - Kjulavkovski

MENTOR PROFESSOR
PhD Milena Dragićević Šešić

BELGRADE
2018

Contents

Acknowledgements 3
Abstract 5
Апстракт 7
1. Introduction 9
1.1 Subject of the research 11
1.2 Research question 13
1.3 Goals and hypotheses 14
1.4 Methodology of the research 16
1.5 Keywords 18
1.6 Theoretical framework 18
2. Institutional horizon – Imagining institutions 21
2.1 Traditional and contemporary cultural institutions 21
2.2 Institution making – past, present, language, imagining, self-instituting 26
2.2.1 Public sphere and governing ideology 27
2.2.2 Governing the horizon of institutions through the past and the present 35
2.3 The language of the (post)institution 39
2.4 Imagining the future of the (post)institution through the past, the present, and the future 44
2.5 Modelling the institution through visioning 47
2.6 Post-institution and post-managerial paradigm 58
2.7 Methodology and tactic towards modelling of new institutions – Internalisation of the critique and practices or a parallel agency of change 64
3. Organizing institutional imagination or organizing the (post)institutional paradigm 70
3.1 Organization and institution 70
3.2 Strategic planning and decision-making in organizations and institutions 78
3.2.1 Self-organization as governance and decision-making 81
3.3 Models and modes of institutions and organizations in performing arts 89
3.3.1 General models – standard model and collaborative model 91
3.3.2 Standard model (traditional/mainstream, homogenized managerial structure) Traditional or mainstream cultural institution model (homogenized managing structure, standard systematization of working places) 93
3.3.2.1 Specifics of the standard-vertical-model and its varieties of public, commercial, and independent theatre 95
3.3.2.2 Specific model of a public theatre: Repertoire theatre 104
3.3.3 Collaborative model (new models, heterogenic managing structure, self-instituting) 106
3.3.3.1 Models in the alternative theatre scene "collaborative – horizontal – model" 106

3.4 The alternative theatre in Macedonia 108
4. (One) perspective on performing arts 113
4.1 Dance, choreography, performance as contexts related notions 114
4.2 Dance spectrum – basic differences and specificities 120
4.3 Dance, choreography and performance as notions and fields in Macedonia 131
5. Performing the theoretical tools – The independent sector as a potential for new modelling 142
5.1 Independent organizations as temporary zones of critical reflection (case studies of Macedonia and the ex-Yugoslavia region) 143
5.2 Analysis of the independent sector in culture in the region – new tactics and strategies 158
5.2.1 New tactics and strategies for development in the independent cultural scene 159
5.2.1.1 Creation of new spaces – enhancing the visibility of the independent sector 161
5.2.1.2 Temporary platforms with institutions 170
5.3 Analyses and outcomes of both approaches (the strategies of creation of spaces and temporary platforms) 175
5.4 New strategic approaches – Legacy converted into new approaches and strategic alliances – networking and co-governing models (case studies and analyses) 178
6. Artist driven cultural policies vs top-down policies 196
6.1 General overview of the EU and ex-Yugoslavia policies in dance and performance 196
6.2 Advocacy on regional level and dance policy in Macedonia 202
6.3 Cultural policy making and development 217
6.3.1Participative methodology of policy making 217
6.3.1.1 Macedonia – PPP and mixed or hybrid model 222
6.4 Shared policy for new public culture, or from paternalistic institution to (post)modern institution 227
6.4.1 From shared policies and participative governance to rhizomatic governance and institution model (imagining) 232
7. Performing arts institution – An agent of societal and political transformations 236
(as Conclusion) 236
7.1 The performing arts institution in Macedonia 238
8. Bibliography 251
Appendix I 264
Case Study 264
REZIME DISERTACIJE NA SRPSKOM JEZIKU 286
Biography 316
Изјава о ауторству 321
Изјава о истоветности штампане и електронске верзије докторске дисертације / докторског уметничког пројекта 322
Изјава о коришћењу 323

Acknowledgements

This thesis was prepared to a large extent as a continuous long-term academic research and working experience of the author in the past ten years. Working precariously to provide for existential needs, but never giving up on the vision and strive to research and reflect through academic work. I have been part of different (advocacy) networks that enabled me to generate and transform the knowledge, which I owe most to the colleagues in Nomad Dance Academy with whom I share the values, visions, and ideas that I have mostly referred to in this thesis. Without their exceptional support, potential to share, and will to address changes, I would not have made it. I would like to especially thank my friends and colleagues Dragana Alfirević, Rok Vevar, Marijana Cvetković, Jasmina Založnik, Gisela Müller, who worked very closely with me. Also, I would like to thank my close friends and colleagues who provided their invaluable support: Dejan Srhoj, Angelina Georgieva, Iva Sveshtarova, Willy Prager, Stefan Shtereff, and Aleksandra Janeva Imfeld. In the beginning, I had the opportunity to work with Ana Vujanović with whom I continued working through Critical Practice_ Made in Yu, and to whom I am also deeply grateful. In between I met my colleague Ana Žuvela who gave me vital support and sincere guidance, and to whom I also owe a deep sense of gratitude. A debt of gratitude is also owed to Ljiljana Rogać Mijatović for putting up with me for the completion of this rite-of-passage.

My utmost gratitude goes to Professor Milena Dragićević Šešić, who is my genuine inspiration that guided me through different processes, supported and enhanced my work. She also provided input and advice during the entire process of preparation and writing of this thesis, despite it being long-lasting and exhausting. She is the anchor, but also the guide and

flux through theory and practice. Her trust in my capacities, and believing that I will complete the long process of research, was the greatest support that also gave me the will to go forward even in the moments when I thought it was not possible.

I express my gratitude to all my friends and colleagues who helped me with their critical opinions, reflections, and thoughts about topics and subjects presented in this thesis. I also thank everyone who helped me in any way to complete this work.
I would like to name them: A special word of gratitude is due to my closest colleague Violeta Kachakova, as well as to the most inspiring one, Mr. Slobodan Unkovski. Special thanks to other colleagues Filip Jovanovski, Ivana Vaseva, Pavle Ignovski, Ivana Dragsić, and Nevenka Nikolić, as well as everyone who contributed through the interviews. Also, many thanks to my closest friends Margareta Goseva, Jasmina Dukovska, Elica Kocevska, and Niki Tanureva. I am grateful to my partner Goran Kjulavkovski, and especially my dearest Pavlina Kjulavkovska.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to my mother Vera, who passed away while I was working on the thesis, and to my father and brother who were holding me and whose support and love I acknowledge with gratitude. A special dedication goes to my daughter, Nika Kjulavkovska, who was born when I was starting with this journey. This work should remind her to never give up, and to be brave and stubborn, but also very open and wanting to learn and transform herself.

The author

Abstract

This thesis examines the theory and pragmatic tensions and questions related to the cultural institutions. It researches the needs in the art field of contemporary performing arts, and it is engaged in the inquiry of other methodological approaches than the traditional one, which would support the working processes and their development.

The thesis creates a dialogue between diverse theoretical positions from where the cultural institution and the notion of the institution are observed, bringing forward the specificities of the art field, but also emphasizing the context relevance and impact.

The theoretical approaches, data and information collected in this thesis should advance the correlation between the theory and the practice in the governance or management of the institutions in the field of culture.

Furthermore, it portrays and analyzes the efforts and contributions of the civil sector (the independent cultural sector) in experimenting, thinking, and practicing the new governing models in which culture is produced. It introduces arguments on the need of artistic driven cultural policies, or advocacy actions aiming to enhance the policy changes in the region of ex-Yugoslavia, the institutional paradigm, and the working conditions in the cultural field. It brings forward the specificity of the contemporary performing arts (dance, performance, and choreography), as a perspective of the marginalized art field that strives for basic support. It elaborates what the notion of contemporary performing arts (dance, choreography, and performance), which is considered as contemporary performative practice, comprehends by this thesis.

Within the frameworks of reviewing the cultural institution, the theoretical frame of the postmodern perspective of the organization theory is offered as the one that reconsiders the organizational format of a cultural institution.

The thesis proposes an institution as a *producer of sociality*, or an *agency for socio-political transformations* versus the institution solely as a *producer of aesthetics*.

Such theoretical structure is a proposal of a frame for analyzing and understanding both the socio-political and the hegemonic cultural practices and art institutions, on the one hand, and a new managerial perspective created through the deconstruction of the dominant managerial models of institutions in the field of choreography, dance, and performance, or ballet and theatre. This perspective offers the post-managerial paradigm in culture, and is related to what has been suggested in the thesis as post-institution, co-institution, heterogenic management, and self-organized systems. The method of forming such institution is researched and recommended through participative governance, and rhizomatic governance (organizational), related to the policy making approach of *shared policies*. Also, by proposing this framework, the thesis aims to emphasize the perspective of governance of culture and management in culture as a socially relevant and aware field that is not only driven as prior from the market needs, but it is also reflecting the society and the context as prior. Therefore, it aims to move forward the management of the cultural institution towards the field of "common", where a post-institution would be a relevant socio-political form that can be governed by shared policy making, or through methods of participatory governance, or managed through a "rhizome" methodology based on collaboration, shared leadership, co-curating, and discussion, and strive for qualified understanding of culture and art as one of the highest and most precious resources in the contexts.

Апстракт

Ова теза бави се теоријом као и практичним тензијама и питањима који се односе на културне институције. Истражује потребе уметничке области савремених извођачких уметности и усмерена је ка трагању за другачијим методолошким приступима од оног традиционалног, а како би подржала радне процесе и њихов развој.

Теза остварује дијалог између различитих теоријских позиција из којих се посматрају културна институција и појам институције, истичући специфичности уметничког поља, али и издвајајући релевантност контекста и учинка у њему.

Теоријски приступи, подаци и информације прикупљени у оквиру ове тезе требало би да унапреде међусобне односе између теорије и праксе у вођењу или управљању институцијама у области културе.

Даље, она приказује и анализира напоре и доприносе цивилног сектора (независног културног сектора) у експериментисању, промишљању и практиковању нових управљачких модела у којима се производи култура. Она уводу аргументе за културне политике засноване на потребама уметника или заговарачке акције са циљем да се подстакну промене јавних политика у региону бивше Југославије, институционалне парадигме и радни услови у области културе. Такође, истиче специфичност извођачких уметности (плеса, перформанса и кореографије) као перспективе маргинализоване уметничке области која се бори за базичну подршку. Теза развија појам савремених извођачких уметности (плес, перформанс и кореографија) који се разматра као савремена изведбена пракса.

Унутар разматрања о институцијама културе, понуђен је теоријски оквир заснован на теорији организације постмодерне оријентације уз помоћ којег се поново разматра организациони формат институције културе.

Теза предлаже разумевање институције као *произвођача друштвености*, или *агента социо-политичке трансформације* насупрот институције као искључиво *произвођача естетског*.

Оваква теоријска структура је предлог новог оквира за анализу и разумевање социо-политичких и хегемоних културних пракси и уметничких институција, са једне стране, као и нове управљачке перспективе створене кроз деконструкцију доминантних менаџерских модела институција у области кореографије, плеса и перфоманса или балета и позоришта. Ова перспектива нуди пост-менаџерску парадигму у култури, и односи се на оно што је у тези предложено као пост-институција, ко-институција, хетерогено управљање и само-организовани системи. Метод формирања такве институције је истраживан и препоручен кроз партиципативно управљање и ризоматско управљање (организационо), а у вези са приступом креирања културних политика као *заједничких политика* (*shared policies).* Такође, предлажући овакав оквир, теза тежи да истакне разумевање управљања у култури и менаџмента у култури као друштвено релевантне и одговорне области која није искључиво вођена потребама тржишта, већ промишља друштвени контекст. Према томе, циљ је да се унапреди менаџмент културних институција ка пољу „заједничког“ (common), где би пост-институција била релевантна друштвено-политичка форма којом се може управљати кроз заједничке политике путем метода партиципативног управљања или кроз методологију „ризома“ засновану на сарадњи, заједничком вођству, ко-курирању, дискусијама, тежећи стручном разумевању културе и уметности као једних од најважнијих и најдрагоценијих ресурса у сваком контексту.

1. Introduction

This thesis elaborates the core aspects through which contemporary performing arts (performance, dance and choreography) institutions can be (re)formed. It encompasses the perspective that an institutional model is possible as a context-driven model, and an institution is, and can be, an agency for socio-political transformations, or a producer of socialites. As an 'agency', a cultural institution involves processes, protocols, tactics, strategies, and procedures specific to the program or content that is planned to be produced or created, disseminated, and communicated with the public, the audience.

Through the review of the theories of institutions, the analysis of public policies and the socio-political context, this thesis proposes a theoretical and methodological framework of institution for performing arts, or contemporary performative practices (dance, performance, and choreography), which will be referred to as performing arts in this thesis, since they are viewed as such in the registers of the cultural policies.

The existing theories of institutions and cultural policies are researched and compared with the aim of defining the relation of different viewpoints towards the already established notion (performing arts), as well as with the aim of establishing *common and new viewpoints* – new theory proposals and methodologies for institutions and cultural policy.

The institutions and the cultural policy should address the existing needs and, accordingly, contribute to change the organisational and program practice. The recently developed conditions and needs in the field of contemporary performing arts demand critical reflection, adaptation, deconstruction of old and construction of new models, approaches, and theories of the cultural institutions, in this case those that are working in the field of performing arts.

This process of research is influenced by the practices found in the independent cultural sector, which incorporate the performing arts practices, their theoretical and practical development, their interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach that forms a certain base

of knowledge (heterogeneous, nomadic) developed through different types of media (body, texts, space, images). Such practices demand methodologicaly different governing approaches and theoretical perspectives of institution development.

The combination of various types of knowledge requires transformation and critical investigation of the methodological approaches, as well as analyses in the form of dialogue and interaction that can bring forward new theories.

Previously researched theories on institutions are used as a basis for defining adequate principles and models allowing (re)formation and sustainable (trans)formation of the contemporary performing arts institutional realm. They are proposed as a basis in order to address the needs in the field, to envisage the environment in which qualitative changes of the organizational and program function of the existing institutions can be applied.

The focus is on the development of a methodological approach towards creating an institutional model that should comprise performing practices dealing with the issue where the central problem of the artistic practice and discourse is the problem of performing, or production of new meaning of performing. The performing arts are researched through the aspect of performance studies and other interdisciplinary theoretical approaches. Moreover, performing art works dealing with the field of choreography as an extended practice, addressing dance and performance from the perspective of different media, extending the disciplinary boundaries of performing, incorporating the aspects of common, collaboration, activism, and authorship. This perception allows for an interdisciplinary approach, involving the practices found in the independent or freelance cultural sector, or micro socio-political artistic processes and practices as a ground that shares values, introduces new formats of reflection, collaboration, production, dissemination of art works, as well as economic exchange.

The institution is imagined, but also empirically accessed. It is imagined as an on-going and never-finished process, but also as a tactic to re-establish the public space as a place for critical reflection on society, or as an attribute to the cultural public sphere.

1.1 Subject of the research

The subject of research in this thesis is related to the notion of the institution in culture, the identification of methodological, theoretical, and policy potentials which will enable its further exploration, study, and implementation in a specific socio-cultural, economic, and political context.

The subject of the research is based on the analysis of different theoretical discourses, incorporating sociology, the organization theory, critical theory, performance studies, and the management theory. Furthermore, it also incorporates the analysis of the practices and principles of work in the civil sector, or the independent sector in Macedonia and ex-Yugoslavia, where most of the contemporary art development is situated.

Theories and field findings are used as "an analytical tool, a method of spatial and political criticism and articulation that can be applied not only to the art world, but to spaces and institutions in general" (Sheikh, 2006).

Such approach allows the redefinition of the contemporary performing art working processes, as well as the institution as an art system through:

- Dialogue between public institutions and civil society *artivists,* or the *independent cultural sector;*

- New approaches, mechanisms, and strategies for the development of the performing arts institutional model based on analyses of theoretical and scientific discourses, as well as field findings;
- Positioning of the performing art institution in the system of contemporary culture, its transformation from an institution of traditional representation to an institution of contemporary creation (or cultural and social agency);
- Scientific and artistic research and analyses that will result in a new methodological approach and theoretical development of the notion of cultural institution and its application;
- Insight into the changes in cultural policy, education, global relations, technological development, knowledge–based society, and positioning the institution towards such global and local changes;
- Analysis of the strategic planning of performing arts for reformation of the traditional organizational program-based concept of the institutions and the cultural policy based on genre diversification.

The fields explored through this subject are converging different issues in arts and culture, with an emphasis on theories of the system of art and culture in the contemporary society, but also policies and politics as determinants of the possible development of the new theories and model of the cultural institution (performing art).

The subject of this research encompasses the following components:

1. management of cultural institutions (organization theory, sociology, management theory, critical theory);

2. interdisciplinary approach in the arts; micro-organizational models, their practices (programming, collaboration, curating), strategies, and tactics;

3. cultural policy and socio-political development (contextualisation of performing arts).

1.2 Research question

The research question is related to findings and analyses on the theory of institutions, policies, actual conditions, and possible factors that influence the development of new models of institutions for performing arts:

What are the theoretical and policy approaches which can address the needs of the contemporary performing arts field and its potentials, and create a new managerial paradigm and a new model of a contemporary performing art organization or an institution that can enhance the qualitative development of the field?

Other questions which the main research question entails are:

- How can theories be implemented in the existing socio-cultural and economic context and the cultural system, or what is the methodological framework of their application in the field?

- How a cultural system should respond to the needs of the cultural workers?

- What are the methodologies of support of the bottom–up cultural policy making that supports the institutional reforms or formation of new models?

- To what extent is it possible to improve the organizational governance through new managerial approaches?

The aim of the research question is to identify and establish new theories of institutions as a context-based object of study, in which the contemporary performing art practice can be entailed.

An additional aim of the research question is to define methods and techniques for structural changes of the existing institutions or paradigms (for example, theatre and ballet), propose a new approach towards the performing arts system, and propose a new model for the performing art institution.

This methodological approach is systematic and researches different contextual (ex-Yugoslavian) experiences in the contemporary performing arts, as well as European, related to general policies, initiatives in reformation of institutions, and supporting mechanisms of the field.

1.3 Goals and hypotheses

Hypothesis

The general hypothesis, which is the starting point of this doctoral thesis, is that a quality model of an institution for contemporary (performing) arts is not possible without theoretical and policy analyses, and research of context-related socio-political and cultural specifics, as well as the needs of the art field, based on critical reflection and participative dialogue.

In order to test this general hypothesis, we have to underline few specific hypotheses:

- New theoretical models of the institutions are not possible without the development of a new methodological frame of governance and policy making processes where all

stakeholders and beneficiaries are included - or the public (authorities, audience) and the private or civil sectors (artists, cultural workers, activists) in the governing and decision-making processes;

- New theories of institutions in culture and in performing arts have to be related to the context, in order to form models based on inclusiveness and diversity, where social ties are produced;

- New theories of models of institutions in culture need to concern the public space as a place of breakthrough of creative pluralism and heterogeneity, or contemporary creation and discontinuation of the traditional representation.

The hypothesis is based on the research of several case studies of regional and European cultural institutions and initiatives for reformation of the institutions in culture, as well as on theoretical discourses by different authors (M. Dragićević Šešić, S.Dragojević, A. Vujanović, A. Jovićević, G. Raunig, S. Milevska, T. Kaufmann, S. Sheikh, P. Gielen, J. McKenzie, M. Jo Hatch, I. Lorey, R. Schechner, M. Carlson, and others).

Goals

The general goal of this thesis is *to identify and establish new theories of institutions as a context-based object of study, in which contemporary performing art practice can be entailed.*

The goals are as follows:

- To research the notion of institution and its application through analytical, descriptive, project and program modelling, as well as scientific–theoretical and analytical tools;

- To research diverse methods of criticism and deconstruction of already established theories
- To research methodologies of creation of new models of institutions for contemporary performing arts;
- To develop ideas on new organizational models of institutions in culture;
- To develop new methodological approaches of governance for the creation of institutional models;
- To present and support relevant policy making approaches that support the new institutional paradigm.

1.4 Methodology of the research

An interdisciplinary approach is used as the most appropriate for analyses which take into consideration the specificity of the performing arts and cultural institutions. It allows analyses of the institution of performing arts through its relation to the contextual bases (historical, theoretical, and practical) and the interrelationships and interdependencies with the "social authorities" (market, politics, media, and other) by which it is defined.

The methodological frame is based on desk and field research:

1. The desk research combines:

a) Analysis of data collected through research of policy papers, policy reports, readers, Internet findings, legislative acts, and other relevant resources. Qualitative methods of interpretative research on contextual analysis and comparative analysis are used;

b) Theoretical research based on the study of theoretical discourses in cultural management, cultural policy, analytical aesthetics, institutional theory of art, history of arts, sociology of arts and culture, and sociology of organization. Identifying the key terms of the research and using them into the elaboration of a methodological approach towards the forming of an institution, adapting it to the field of cultural management of a performing art institution.

2. The field research combines different empirical methods such as:

a) Interviews with cultural workers in the independent sector in Macedonia and ex-Yugoslavia in order to provide qualitative information on governance models in the civil sector, or the independent cultural sector;

b) Participation in diverse initiatives for dance/choreography/performing arts spaces, institutions (conferences, advocacy events, meetings, artistic projects);

c) case studies of initiatives dealing with the analysis of the institution in the field of performing arts, as well as case studies of models of public-civil or public–private models of institutions in Macedonia, ex-Yugoslavia, and Europe; and,

d) Observations of several actions and activities related to the advocating for changes of institution or reflecting on the issue, in Belgium, Germany, and Holland.

3. Methods of analysis and interpretation:

- Theoretical analysis of theories on institution, organization theories, critical theories, sociology in culture and management in arts and culture.

- Context and discourse analysis of policy and other relevant documents concerning the performing arts development.

- Qualitative analysis of the principles, methods, formats, tactics, and strategies, as well as of the micro–level organizations in the independent cultural sector in Macedonia and ex-Yugoslavia.

4. Comparative analysis of theories and applied policies organized in thematic categories, qualitative analysis of methodological approaches towards the formation of a new model of institution.

1.5 Keywords

Cultural institutions, contemporary performing arts, independent cultural sector, post-managerial paradigm in culture, post-institution, co-institution, participative governance, rhizomatic (organizational) governance, shared policies, shared leadership, co-curating.

1.6 Theoretical framework

The subject of the research belongs to the humanities (history of art, performing arts, performance studies) and the social sciences (cultural management, cultural policy, cultural studies, sociology of art and culture, sociology of organization, organization theory, theory of social institutions, contemporary socio-political theories).

The approach of the research is interdisciplinary, and applying the method of "piercing through" (Pristaš, Hrvatin and Kunst, 2007 cited in Dimitrov and Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, 2017, p.28), which allows for a synthetic understanding of contemporary performing arts institutions, and therefore, of the cultural policy whose character is interdisciplinary.

Consequently, the research takes into consideration different fields such as cultural management and cultural policy, sociology of art and culture, sociology of organization, history of art, institutional critique, communication and curatorial studies.

Diverse theoretical views in diverse theoretical fields are reviewed in relation to: institution, instituting and ideological framework in which institutions are accessed (Gielen, 2013; 2009; Kangas and Vestheim, 2010; Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas, 2005), public space and sphere (Vujanović and Cvejić, 2012; Habermas, McGuigan, 1996) management, organization theory and policies (Hatch and Cunliffe, 2006; Meadows, 2008; Varbanova, 2013; Klaić, 2012; Čopić, 2011; Katunarić, 2005; Dragićević Šešić, 2005; 2006; 2018; Dragojević, 2005; Drezgić, 2018), institutional critique and critical theory (Mouffe, 2013; Milevska, 2007; Möntmann, 2007; Raunig, 2004; 2009; Althusser, 1970; Sheikh, 2011; Cornelius Castoriadis, Kunst, 2017), theory of performing arts (Jovicevic and Vujanović, 2006; Schechner, 2002; Vujanović and Cvejić, 2012), and many other.

Theories are used to reflect through the view that art is a social system that enables and determines the art production, the meaning, art is a socially institutionalized practice, and has to be interpreted through context analyses, to paraphrase Vujanović (2004, p.129).

Vital questions are answered through the proposed approach. These include: do democratic post-transitional societies, such as Macedonia, have the preconditions, and how can these be developed, to appropriate the cultural institutions to the needs of the context and the art forms?; and, whether the theories and the model of performing art institutions as public spaces can be the basis for enabling the development of heterogenic art forms, as well as their larger socio-cultural penetration through relation and inclusion of other socio-cultural themes and actions.

Within the frameworks of reviewing the cultural institution, a theoretical frame is proposed of the postmodern perspective of the organization theory (Hatch and Cunliffe, 2006) that focuses on the deconstruction of the organizational texts, while destabilizing the managerial ideologies and the modernist models of organizing and theorizing, revealing the marginalized and oppressed views, supporting the reflexive and inclusive forms of theorizing and organizing. This perspective considers dance, choreography, and performance as extended performative practices or performance/performing arts, by offering the deconstruction of the dominant managerial models of institutions in the field of choreography, dance, and performance, or ballet and theatre, and offering a new managerial perspective. In addition, it offers an opportunity to review these art practices through a new perspective which is not conditioned in this case by the discipline or the tradition as starting fields of values.

2. Institutional horizon – Imagining institutions

In this chapter, the author analyzes the difference between the traditional and the contemporary cultural institutions, and the understanding of the term *institution* in different contexts (theoretical, socio-political, and cultural). When thinking about the institution, we need to balance its past, present, and future function, or relations. Hereby, the author also addresses the dance art filed as a subsystem that belongs to diverse hierarchical policy systems, which are defining its relations with the audience, within the field and other social authorities. Conventions and classifications within the field or the system of art are codes of communications with the audiences, as well as with the policy makers.

The proposed theoretical views on post-managerial paradigm and post-institution or co-institution are reviewed with the remark that changes of the traditional codifications and classifications which go along with the new modelling, need translation, or language transformation within the system of management and in policies, in order to effectuate the changes.

2.1 Traditional and contemporary cultural institutions

Cultural policy and cultural institutions cannot escape the strong mechanisms for change in their environments. The continuous urge to change and adapt to new conditions causes dynamics, instability, and permanence in the institutions. Within the last period, we are faced with large debates on the institution reformations, which are spreading through theoretical imagining to institutional critique, organization and institutional theory, management and cultural policy studies.

This is not new, but after the financial crises and geopolitical changes, it has become evident that institutions in culture and art need to be reformed, or re-imagined. However, since the 1980s, traditional cultural institutions (the theatre, opera, library, ballet, museum) have been criticized for being "conservative "iron cage" bureaucracies, self-protecting and non-creative and immune against radical new ideas in artistic and cultural content, as well as management and organisation" (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010).

Artists employed in these institutions are criticized for being more of 'civil servants' (service providers according to the new law of public institutions in Macedonia) rather than creative artists. Lifelong contracts support the aspect of historicity of the institutions and hinder artistic renewal and development. Critical reflection goes in different directions, and the general sublimation is that traditional institutions take a large portion of yearly budgets for culture, maintaining a large machinery that does not produce new, exciting, educational material; they are oriented towards a past and high standard routine that does not allow for contemporaneity; they are supporting traditional values and are nation oriented and centralized; their employees have lifelong contracts which produce inertia and hold back artistic development.

Criticisms are coming from artistic and cultural circles, or from the freelance scene, the independent sector which would also like to see the institutions with new "artistic experiments, projects, short time contracts, less influence from trade unions, flexible organisation, and a rapid labour turnover. (See Beckman and Menson, 2008; Nilsson, 2003; Kirveennummi, 2003)" (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010). Criticisms are also coming from neoliberal economists and management theorists who are promoting the institutions as more independent from the state and turned towards the market.

Kangas and Vestheim (2010) are of the opinion that what brings these two different groups – aesthetically radical artists and neo-liberal economists – into an alliance and being against traditional welfare state subsidised cultural institutions is that they share the belief in autonomy and freedom from the state.

> The entrepreneurial credo of free markets regulated by individual agents is not too far from the classical liberal myth of the autonomous artist, operating in an autonomous field of art, free from politics and money. […] The liberal ideas of individual independence and freedom of the late 18th and the early 19th century. (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010)

However, such view is not oriented towards any specifics in a certain context, but is based on a general perspective, also related to the welfare state subsidised institutions, and not to institutions developed in other contexts, such as in ex-Yugoslavia and post-Yugoslavia countries.

Notwithstanding, artists are not critical towards welfare state cultural institutions per se, but are viewing the institutions as new modes of governing and functioning.

Multiculturalism, the economic importance of the cultural sector (cultural/creative/socio-cultural industries), as well as the role of the cultural sector in the strategies of urban, city, and other social developments and competiveness are topics in the focus of global policies development. "New public management" techniques were developed over the 1980s to address the changes in the public sector accounted for in a number of OECD[1] countries, and associated with doctrines of public accountability and organizational best practices that are

[1] On 14 December 1960, 20 countries originally signed the Convention on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Since then, 15 countries have become members of the Organisation.

penetrating into the public management field. This model was developed with the aim to introduce a “business – like” model to public institutions, or to re-form the public institutions with the models coming from the private sector.

“New public management” tactics and paradigms in the name of efficiency and accountability have also challenged cultural institutions. Marketisation and privatisation have been increasingly welcomed (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010).

The understanding of the term institution has to be distinguished –in the sense of cultural policy making as an ‘institution’, i.e. as an organised pattern for establishing and implementing public policy in the cultural field, and in the sense of traditional organisations such as theatres, libraries, museums, and other, working and functioning as ‘institutions’. Kangas and Vestheim (2010) see these two cases as related to the concept of ‘path dependency’ in institutional theory, which will be explained in more detail in the subsequent chapters.

Traditional institutions in culture are functioning according to the principle of excellence in a particular activity, and are protecting the values in a specific field as they are institutionalizing them. Values in the field are changing, and are based on paradigm development supported by research, theoretical work, and aesthetical reflection.

Institutions develop their paradigm or a classification system that is related to the field in development. I approach the field not as an imaginary, or abstract, but a pragmatically understood environment represented through specifics such as venues, collaborations, festivals, projects, theoretical platforms, workshops, researches, relations, comprehension, reflection, and other. The field can only exist with its functional specific modes through which the paradigm can be developed.

The paradigm develops a system of relationships between the practices in the field (traditional, new, or drama theatre, experimental, post-drama, physical, dance-theatre, and other) which is hierarchically formed. Dance is a subsystem in diverse hierarchical policy systems that define the hierarchical relations. For example, in Macedonia it falls under "stage arts", which also comprise theatre and music. Classifications or institutionalizations of values are operating both internally and externally. These classifications are formal, and the audience is communicated through them. The audience expect a certain artistic work to be presented by a certain institution, but the institution is also formalizing protocols of behaviour or implicit conventions by classification (for example, at the Philharmonic concert, or opera, ballet, drama, theatre, the performance protocols of behaviour as implicit conventions are separate from those in an experimental theatre, or space for contemporary dance/art).

Therefore, the institutions enable a certain experience of art in a(n) (un)familiar manner. The challenge is in the experience of those arts that are questioning the familiar, or the known, trying to change the art and social context, or the question is how to prescribe to this experience? Davor Mišković (2015, p.9) discusses this issue, and gives the example of the museum of contemporary art in the family of museums that continuously question historicity and temporality, institute critical reflection of art, artistic conventions, art organizations, society, societal conventions, systems of work, as well as distribution of work, wealth, education, and other.

Institutionalizing subversion can be seen as a component to achieve equality, liberty, fraternity, and so on. If such ideas are absorbed by the society, or create tendencies as such, they might lose their social force. Davor Mišković (2015, p.10) provides an additional example to this, comparing it with the Renaissance and the Baroque, and saying that the Baroque absorbed many revolutionary ideas from the Renaissance, fascinating people with the "stew" for decades, while not even intending at any time to socially address anything.

Furthermore, corporations today absorb many ideas coming from the art world without the intention to genuinely address societal issues. Mišković (2015, p.10) states that similar to the Baroque, contemporary art museums absorb different revolutionary and subversive art, social, cultural trends in the system, which is the dominant elite, generally separated from the larger society, and therefore seen by the larger population as a non-functional whole.

Indeed, it is often seen as dysfunctional because most people in the arts are still expecting order, classification, or conventions to which they can respond, and the museum of contemporary art is (should be) reinventing the modes of presentation, reflecting on the values, and therefore, on the conventions. Although the order in museums of contemporary art certainly exists, most of the population does not recognize it, since it does not recognize the conventions and values reflected in the work of the museum.

Museums of contemporary art are determined with the classification system of visual arts, and not with divergent social practices. From the perspective of dance, or contemporary dance and performing arts practices, we are facing the same problem of classification, and therefore recognition and understanding.

The dance convention is regulated institutionally and, in a certain cultural paradigm, it belongs to classical ballet and other dance expressions such as modern, contemporary and/or experimental which are not recognizable since they are principally communicating with the professional environment.

2.2 Institution making – past, present, language, imagining, self-instituting

Certain theoretical views on institutions as public spaces and their role in the public sphere supported by a certain ideology of governing are established hereby. The starting point is the

perspective that institutions are organizations established by people the goal of which should be to proactively re-define and re-affirm the system of values they represent. They present instituted values which are defining the public sphere. In this relation, an overview of the public space and public sphere is provided below, in relation to the institutions with the tradition, present policies, and the future.

2.2.1 Public sphere and governing ideology

As a social structure, the institution is a manifestation of a certain ideology, or in Foucault's conception, it is the material and the economic manifestation of ideology. When we talk about institutions, we can talk about the art institution as a wider concept in this sense, or as a specific institution of art and culture, always being a manifestation of power.

Ideologies are mostly created by centres of power, or the governing bodies in given environments and states. And, more often, institutions are conducting preconceived policies, or are operating in the formulated political realm. Therefore, the system of arts and culture is facing subordination by the protocols invented by the centres of power, the governing or economic bodies. To paraphrase Pascal Gielen (2013), the institution is primarily experienced as an external reality, being regulated through a certain social authority, and as a singular regime of values, or objectivity standing above individual manufacturability. The main criticism in the art world is based on this perspective, and therefore on the question of whether the role of the cultural and arts institutions is to be mediators of power, or the opposite. Thinking of institutions through the critical theory, or the artistic perspective, is often an imaginative process, which is confronted with context specifics, or an environment that is rarely open to address the aspects foreseen by the professionals in the field of art and

culture. Moreover, the dialogue between the policy and the theory, or visioning/imagination is infrequent.

However, through this research, I will try to converge and envisage how this would be possible, or try to provide empirical solutions or recommendations. Therefore, I will start with the aspects of thinking institution based in critical theory and sociology, and give a view of cultural institution studies and cultural policy studies.

In her text, "The Rise and Fall of New Institutionalism, Perspectives on a Possible Future", Nina Möntmann (2007) asks the vital questions from the perspective of this thesis: "What do we actually expect from an art institution? What do we want an institution to stand for? What desires does an institution in the art field produce?".

Institutions are organizations established by people whose goal should be to proactively re-define and re-affirm the system of values they represent, having in mind historicity, but not holding back development because of the historical burdens.

An overview of the institution as a system of value created in the society is related to the manifestation of certain ideology. Louis Althusser (1970) situates the cultural institutions, fine arts, and literature in the state of an ideological apparatus. Classical Marxists were treating the state as a more complex reality, as it was in the definition of the "Marxist theory of the state". They recognized this problem in practice and did not formulate it in theory, or as Althusser (1970) explains, only Gramshi had the idea that the state cannot be presented only through the state repressive apparatus but there are other institutions from "civil society" such as the church, school, syndicates, and other. Still, he did not systematize his thoughts, but Althusser (1970) further developed on them. He proposes that the state includes other than the state repressive apparatus. In the Marxist theory, the *State apparatus* includes: the government, the army, administration, police, courts, jails, and other, which he proposes to be

called the *State repressive apparatus*. Here, repressive refers to the "functioning with violence" – in the final extension. As he explains, this is because repression or administrative repression does not have to emit or have a physical form. However, as a secondary element they employ *ideology* as a *way of functioning*, and therefore, there is no clear repressive apparatus.

On the other side is the state ideological apparatus, or as he explains, the form of specific and specialized institutions. He proposes an empirical list of the following specific and specialized institutions in the state ideological apparatus: religious, educational (including public and private schools), family, legislative, political, syndicates or syndical, informational (media- print, radio, and electronic), and cultural. Their function is determined by ideology as primary tactic, and repression as secondary.

There is a multitude of state ideological apparatuses, and most of them are part of the public sphere, but also the private. The difference between private and public is in the bourgeois right to execute their "power" in certain domains. An area that is not into the public or the private is the state that is a state of the government in power, or the governing class. Althusser (1970) states that the importance is not in the belonging to the private or the public, but it is in how they function or the way of functioning.

However, these theses do not see institutions only as public institutions in their system of governing, but also as institutions that are producing the public, or the publicly relevant content, or socially relevant instances.

In carrying out an institutional critique, Maja Ćirić (2012, p.85) provides an overview of the art world as a public sphere[2] and builds the following standpoints: 1. It is not unique, it is conflictual and represents a platform for different and oppositional subjects, politics and

[2] Using Welchman's standpoint.

economies, and battle field[3], where different ideological positions are fighting for power and sovereignty 2. It is not an autonomous system, but it is regulated by the economy and politics, and it is always in relation with other spheres, which is contrary to what Simon Sheikh suggests, and that is the creation of the autonomous from others societal systems, to be elaborated below.

The Public Sphere is a social and political concept. Ana Vujanović and Bojana Cvejić note:

> We conceive of the public as a discursive sphere of society which consists of citizens' speech, actions, and movements, the "words and deeds", as Hannah Arendt would have it, that can be considered articulations and expressions of ideology. In order to operate politically, the public sphere needs, and hence seeks, public space. (Vujanović and Cvejić, 2012, p.13)

The public space and the public sphere are two close, yet, divergent categories that Vujanović and Cvejić (2012) are proposing to be seen as separate concepts, since their implications are not symmetrical. The public space is most often understood as a physical, spatial category, while the public sphere as discursive. The public sphere needs a public space, however, the public space is not always a space of the public sphere, since it can be touristic, entertainment, leisure, and other. An important issue, according to them, in and around the public is the degree of inclusivity. The public space has been going through crises not only because it is privatized, but also because it has been seen as the crisis of representation in representative democracy.

They also say that the public sector (to which public institutions belong) belongs to the notion of the state rather than the public. Cultural and arts institutions should be such public spaces.

[3] Referring to the term of sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and artist Hans Haacke.

In the past decades, or since the 80s, European traditional institutions, as we know them, are in crises since the production of the public has been reduced due to the prioritization of privatization through neoliberal capitalism. Such reductions are more evident in the transitional societies. Furthermore, with the expansion of the privatization of public spaces, the public content, or the "words and deeds" are disappearing. According to Vujanović and Cvejić (2012), the crises of the public sphere and public space are not only associated to this, but they are also more broadly seen as crises of representation in representative democracy.

Cultural institutions' crises are pointing to crises of the public in general, of the public opinion and democracy through which it is regulated.

In the first chapter of their book *Public Sphere by Performance*, Vujanović and Cvejić (2012) go through different readings of the "Public sphere", comparing views by Walter Lippmann, John Dewey, Bruno Latour, Hanna Arendt, and others. They talk about Lippmann's lack of faith in a democratic system and its reliance on the mistaken conception of the public as conceived by the democratic theory –

> as a social agency made up of well-informed, continuously interested, "sovereign, and omnipotent citizens" – exists merely as an illusion, myth, abstraction, and, inevitably, a phantom. […] he regards the citizen of his time as a private person generally neither educated, nor interested in taking part in public affairs, which are managed and governed "at distant centres, from behind the scenes, by unnamed powers. (Vujanović and Cvejić, 2012, pp.13-14)

He proposes a differentiation between actors (insiders) and bystanders (outsiders), trying to unmask the public as an abstraction which modern democracies count on. He also identifies the "spectators" or the "publicum" as subjects constituting the public in 1920s in the

American democratic society. He believes that citizens are passive, and are delegating their activities to the experts

since they are incapable or grasping all details operative on the public scene, either because they have no time or because the details are not transparently available or shared, and since they are ill equipped, lacking in the knowledge and skills required for acting in public (Vujanović and Cvejić, 2012, p.14).

What they are also pointing out is Lippmann's view that citizens mobilize only occasionally, in moments of crises, and that is to support or to oppose the actors who govern. On the other hand, Dewey provides a more optimistic view compared to Lippmann, and does not lose faith in democracy, seeing the people in the public as the "Great community". He is proposing a reconsideration of the model of local community (family, neighbours) based on the social idea of democracy, which he distinguishes from the political system of democracy. He sees "individualism" as the main obstacle to communitarians in a democracy, as the ideology of the system of administration. Vujanović and Cvejić (2012, p.16) add:

> There are differences that manifest themselves in diverse attachments that an individual entertains, but Dewey advocates the belief that these differences can be integrated by means of common interests and goals, which are social and beyond individual or private interest.

They further add that the German sociologist and philosopher, Jürgen Habermas, sees the public sphere in the 18th century Europe:

> as a third instance that mediates between society and state. Since being excluded from decision-making in the absolutist and monarchist states of that time, private individuals started to develop the practice of "public use of one's reason" […] – first

> in the domain of literary matters and later on in regard to political affairs as well - from which the liberal public sphere gradually arose. This public sphere, which supposedly achieves consensus on the grounds of (better) argument, is a modern social institution whose function is to guarantee society as a sphere of private autonomy and uphold the restriction of public (feudal, state) authority to only a few functions. What is specifically different about Habermas's conception in comparison with Dewey's, or even more so, Latour's, is that Habermas envisages the liberal public sphere as a public body that transmits the needs of bourgeois society to the state. (Vujanovic and Cvejic, 2012, p.17)

From the perspective of cultural policy studies, Jim McGuigan (1996) suggests that the concept of the public sphere needs to be revised and adapted to the changing conditions, to provoke a critical debate through the prism of cultural policy that he is treating as an object of praxis, an object of theoretical interpretation, and of public debate. In his book, *Culture and the Public Sphere,* he is relating the public sphere discourse with diverse opinions. However, he starts and develops much of them in relation to Habermas. He states that for a critical social theory of communications and culture, 'the public sphere' and the operations of rational-critical debate are most famously conceptualised and analysed by Habermas, and are therefore, of focal concern. Habermas's work is generally concerned with "how we make sense in public, especially how we negotiate our differences with one another and decide upon common purposes" (Holub, 1991cited in McGuigan, 1996, p.21).

McGuigan (1996) gives the example of the use of the term 'public sphere' in Britain that became part of the academic debate over public service broadcasting, and that Nicholas Garnham (1983 and 1990) used to defend the ideal of the public service broadcasting. He debates over the differences of the public sphere and sector, and its regulative matters that are influencing the way it works. "Without provision for public accountability and control, and

without some attempt to foster alternatives to an overbearing state and untrammelled market forces, the prospects for democratic debate and cultural experiment would be curtailed and, indeed, imperilled" (McGuigan, 1996, p.23).

Distinguishing the public sphere from the state, building a critical debate to and with the community to which the public accountability is directly related, enables us to take a position from which we can discern public institutions from the state or an authority regulated institutions, and position them as organizations that institute the common goals and interests of a certain community, presenting a social idea of democracy.

Cultural institutions are public bodies, spaces that are regulating certain political and economic relations through their management structure, and supporting or opposing a certain ideology by producing societal values. Therefore, the management structure of the institution can be seen as a spine that regulates the relations, values, and the ideology, playing an important role in the positioning of the cultural institution as one that institutes new principles of work, production, and development of the art form - as a body that stands for the needs of the art field and the "community of practice", or a regulatory body of the politics in power. Hence, the management system plays an important role in the process of instituting or formulating a certain position in which the art or cultural dimension is created. Management structure and regulations in culture and art should be autonomously positioned in relation to other institutions in the society, and should demand for their own authentic position and possibility to create a specific system that would refer to the needs of the field or the art world.

What should shape the institution is the art world that changes and reshapes. George Dickie is one of the institutional theorists of art who developed his understanding of art as a broad social institution taking further on Danto's thesis that the decisions of certain people and

organizations – artists, then museums and connoisseurs – render objects into art. For him, this thesis already indicates the institutional nature of art, and in his early writings he claims that the artwork is defined by a status conferred upon a certain artefact by people acting on behalf of the art world (Dickie, 1974, p.34 in Vujanović, 2004).

2.2.2 Governing the horizon of institutions through the past and the present

Simon Sheikh (2011) speaks about the theory of Cornelius Castoriadis that the society is an imaginary institution, an imaginary ensemble of institutions, practices, beliefs, and truths that we all subscribe to, and thus, constantly (re)produce. He also suggests that what holds society together is the institution, or as he refers to it "the institution of a society as a whole", where the word institution is understood as norms, values, language tools, procedures and methods of dealing with things and doing things, and the individuals themselves in a general and particular type and form given to them by the society considered.

"Changes in the social imaginaries are emerging through establishment of other imaginaries without predetermination, through practices and will that establish another way of instituting" (Sheikh, 2011, p.16).

He addresses the past, or the historicity, and suggests a radical break with the past in terms of language and symbolization, and thus, the ways of doing. The creation of a new language requires an articulation of what should be said, or not to say the same with new words, but to say new things, to create a language with which to say things. In explaining the Castroriadis theory, he also suggests that these societies are autonomous, or:

> those whose members are *self–instituted*. In contrast, the members of heteronomous societies attribute their imaginary order to something *outside*, to some extra–social authority, such as God, tradition, progress, or historical necessity, or also, we could argue today, democracy as a fundamental and historically inevitable category. (Sheikh, 2011, p.17)

He also brings forward Castoriadis's point that the enormous amount of people in our societies is in fact heteronomous, since they judge on the basis of the convention and public opinion. Public opinion is created by the media which are regulated through the neoliberal ideology, or the ideology of the ruling party in power. Therefore, institutions, or the society as an institution is perceived as an external reality, or a regime of values constituted by the social authorities instead through self-instituting.

Sheikh (2011) makes this distinction concluding that it is the basis on which the making and working of a cultural institution is constituted. Does the institution adhere to the logic and demands of the state and governmentality, or does it seek another path? Does the institution *self-institute*, or does it attribute to the outside power and regulations?

The power of the system upon which a certain society is built, especially the heteronomous people that support this system, which does not allow its change is not to be neglected, but contested. The society members that self-institute are the ones that can obtain the new institution path, but how to oppose an establishment supported by the majority, or how to negotiate (if possible) with the social authorities. The processes of how good practices from the innovative processes, projects, platforms, movements can be instituted, or the methods by which to institute them, represent a challenge. Namely, how can we behave if we are caught up between artistic autonomy, radical and critical thinking and heteronomity of the state and

its neoliberal demands? Where (if possible) can this self-instituting action or heterotopic[4] space (in Foucault's terms) be built and if so, how can it be instituted as part of the society?

Sheikh (2011) adds that it is in the changing of how we institute, of how subjectivity and imagination can be instituted in a different way.

> Any institution and its ways of institution should not be seen as unitary but as dispersed- its modes of addresses need to be uniform, but different in scale and grammar. The late Danish writer Dan Turell had a principle of dividing his works into "overground" and "underground" publications, not only to indicate the difference between self-published manuscripts and more widely-distributed books from publishing houses, but also to point to different formats of experimentation and articulation. Perhaps such a distinction within the institutional production may be more productive to imagine than the traditional distinction between mainstream and alternative, between culture and counter culture […] In other words, institution-making should be described in terms of its outlook, its scope – its horizon. (Sheikh, 2011, p.19)

Cultural institutions can present diverse formats of articulating their content, and therefore, not unitary, but various systems. The contemporary cultural institution in performing arts can also be, in Dan Turell's words, "overground" or "underground", so that it can address different formats of articulation and experimentation, and therefore, a different management structure as support. The homogenisation of the modelling of the institution has to be

[4] Concept by French philosopher Michel Foucault describing spaces which are functioning in non- hegemonic conditions. Foucault (1967): "[...] real places – places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society – which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted" ("Of Other Spaces, Heterotopias").

.

rejected, and heterogeneity in institution making has to be proposed as a post-institutional modeling and governing.

Heterogenic management and modeling can be based on the theoretical dimensions that support the possibility of an *underground* or *self-instituting* system of cultural institution, or moreover, *collaborative- horizontal - models* that would not adhere to the market and the governmentality logic, but would propose a new managerial logic (also as post-institutional) that would support the experimental and counter culture articulation. In this relation, here, I would also introduce a post-institutional model as a "co-institution", or as a term where "co" stands for collaborative, commons, coexisting, and so on, that would be overviewed and presented in the subsequent chapters.

Gielen (2009) explains post – institution through the biennale example, as a periodic and event–based character that makes it possible to work with temporary contracts, bringing the key observation through labour sociology "which in today's art world is rather romantically translated into an uncritical cultivation of a nomadic existence within constantly moving networks" (p.8). He does explain that such Deleuzian flirting with the term of post-institution (more as the preferred jargon of the art world) significantly suppresses the value of the classical art institution. The boom of the biennale offers little room for historicity, does not generate time for thorough research, and often ignores the locality, which are characteristics that a museum does not stand for. The museum is being transformed in the past years, having an increase of temporary exhibitions, decrease of research into and attention to the collection, explaining it as an effect of the biennale virus, displaying the post-institutional characteristics, or becoming a Post-Fordian enterprise (Gielen, 2009, p.9).

He further addresses this friction between the post-institution and the classical modern art institution as schizophrenia, proposing that a good idea in the contemporary art world (or

still, a new idea) is to balance the rigidity with the infinite variability and diversity demanded by the neoliberal network system.

My proposal of post-institution does not go in the post-fordian direction, or in the direction of the Biennale example provided by Gielen, but on the contrary, in the direction of a model that would balance the post-fordian institutional outbreak and the classical modern institution. This would allow incorporating the underground or the self-instituting system in Sheikh's terms as a position from where preserving the past through fiction and reality will be a strategic step forward.

It would also require the production of another language, model, or governing based on a collaborative- horizontal system, or a self-organized system of "co-institution".

2.3 The language of the (post)institution

Proposing a model of post-intuition as a co-institution, or as one of the possible models of the heterogenic management and modeling, demands thinking about the language and the way we communicate the different formats that we produce within the system as self-institute subjects, as one of the steps towards building the new path of the institution. I use format as a term, being aware that it might be read as a term used in economy management, but, in fact, I am trying to use it as a term that describes a working mode or "a way of rendering certain tactics through forms".[5] The new formats proposed to be considered here, in their content and through their language, have to be communicated and addressed to the politics of bureaucracy, or as Sheikh (2011) refers to it, the politics of administration, to make them visible, and not only imaginary. This approach can be one of the tactics towards new

[5] Šuvaković (2010) in *Anti-Jargon*, Method, format, strategy, tactics, practice, procedure, protocol, platform and other exam questions for the professor http://www.antijargon.tkh-generator.net/2010/06/09/suvakovicen

instituting, or towards constituting new models of institution. In other words, it is a proactive approach in the production of policy papers and their communication to the decision makers, which can mostly be seen in other domains and rarely as a practice in the think-thank approach in the field of culture, or rather very small advocacy activities on national levels.[6]

Producing a language system, not as an act of speech, but as a system to be included into the politics in order to address the modelling of post-institutions has to be performed. As Šuvaković would state:

> According to Saussure, we distinguish language and speech. Language implies a language system; speech implies individual speech acts in the frameworks of that language system. When I say "napolju je hladno" (it is cold outside), you know that I am speaking Serbian, but if I say, "it′s a could" you know that I am speaking a bad and clumsy English. What does that mean? It means that every language has those two levels, the system level and the statement level. No mother in the world has taught her child to speak by perching it on her lap, with an orthography and grammar book, and saying: "Look, kiddo, there are seven cases in our language". No, she leads him through speech towards inclusion in the system. (Šuvaković, 2010)

Practically, this would also mean a system of reference to a certain terminology. This will also be reviewed in subsequent sections, through examples of formats through which we render certain tactics or produce content that has a different meaning in the cultural and art context, but is mostly used for other purposes, including, for example, laboratory, workshop,

[6] Here I refer to the countries in the ex-Yugoslavia region, where there is a rare or small amount of advocacy activities, or any actions of think-thank organizations related to the issues of culture in the Balkans. Policy recommendations in culture are mostly formulated by the cultural workers as researches, and addressed in professional language, not articulated as a language of administration that is practiced as part of the think-thank groups.

even discussion, debate, and other. Such terms have their implication in the context in which they are used.

In the postmodern organization theory, the theory of Ferdinand de Saussure, or the theory of language has implications on understanding how organizations are studied and managed. According to him, the language is a system of signs having two parts: the signifier and the signified, whose relationship is arbitrary, since there is no natural or necessary relationship between them, or between the word and a concept. He suggests that the use of language and other signs to make meaning is community specific, and that particular communities have their own systems, and a certain word performs a different meaning depending on whether it is addressing business, culture, government, and other. He talks about a community specific language, or use of words and signs, which, as an idea of communities of meanings, was related to Ludwig Wittgenstein's notion of language games, which discusses how words have different meanings in relation to the rules in the specific communities. In relation to the organization theory, Mary Jo Hatch (2006) explains that language games[7] promote different ideas about what is true, or the way in which organizations can be described and explained. She suggests that "Learning how language games work and how to move comfortably between them will serve you well when working in cross-functional teams, or across other boundaries created by the communities to which you belong" (Hatch, 2006, pp.48-49).

Working on the adaptation of the language and the terms used in the sphere of arts and culture to the normative acts through which the cultural institutions are regulated, is an aspect that has to be directly addressed. A short practical example of this is the use of (new) fields, or professions within institutions through systematization. For instance, the cultural policy in Macedonia does not identify a performer, or a contemporary dancer, or a choreographer in

[7] In his work *Philosophical Investigations*, Ludwig Wittgenstein uses language games to argument that words are defined by how they are used.

the domain of contemporary dance. Or, accordingly, it does not identify production, a project manager in culture, or a theoretician, or a dramaturge, as professions in the cultural institution in Macedonia are limited to a certain institutional format through which the meaning is defined.

These occupations are not mentioned in any catalogue of professions (01/21/2015) of the Ministry of Information Society and Administration of Macedonia, or in the National Classification of Occupations (08.2015) of the State Statistical Office of Macedonia, acts through which a certain profession and its function in the institutional paradigm are defined.

The problem of language is beyond these examples. It might need hermeneutics as procedure and interpretation. However, practically diverse meanings and understandings of the language use and terms are more evident when it comes to content or programing. There is also friction between the classical or the traditional understanding of art, cultural goods and production processes in different communities of practice. If one would like to realize a complex form of a program, or an event in Macedonia that would include diverse formats of displaying art and cultural content, it would not be possible to identify it through policy instruments such as the "open call for programs" of the Ministry of Culture. These instruments are based on policy acts, which do not recognize generative forms, but only traditional mono-formats such as a festival, an exhibition, a concert, or other. This is just a scratch of an example that is practically opting to describe the friction between the "communities of practice" (the policy making system or the normative and artistic/cultural community) which evaluate cultural goods, their symbolic and material meaning, their displaying and distribution through the logic of law and policy. Here, the problem is how the public sphere is conveyed, or if the artistic community participates or not in the policy matters.

Moreover, understanding and language (in its broader meaning) are related to the cultural goods that are seen as symbolic entities which convey and represent a variety of meanings and values in different contexts. Being a cultural good presupposes existence in a public sphere or communities of practice, to which their perception as symbolic or material entities is related.

Cultural goods, which are to be perceived as symbolic and material entities, are subject to various forms of valuation and evaluation.

> The generation of meaning as well as the process of perception and comprehension are social actions that are based on the cultural techniques of coding, decoding, and interpreting. The cultural techniques and the goods' practical uses are inherent to a community of practice. Cultural affairs are always public because they are necessarily related to symbolic meanings that are based on common identities and shared sets of social rules. On the other hand, the access to cultural goods and services cannot always be assumed, because of a lack of know-how. The tension between socio-cultural inclusion and exclusion is an inevitable characteristic of cultural communities. (Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas, 2005, p.150)

Cultural goods as symbolic entities are thus related to the social actions of interpreting, or translating the meanings in the perception, or reception map. They have to be supported in order to shrink the socio-cultural exclusion among and with certain cultural and professional communities.

2.4 Imagining the future of the (post)institution through the past, the present, and the future

In her text *The Institutionalisation, Precarity and the Rhythm of Work*, Bojana Kunst (2017) reflects on imagination as a perplexing condition of every institution, but also a condition that brings people together: "it is also a reason why institutions, when established, try to erase their irrational, misty, impossible core and build monuments to themselves in the form of solid spaces, rules of behaviour and protocols, and archival possessions of the past". She adds: "Because of this foggy imagination in their core, the institutions rationalise their own progress and growth and relate it to the causality of history, they try to systematically control the temporal rhythms in which the future is produced" (Kunst, 2017).

She questions the possibility to practice processes of institutionalisation inside such paradoxical knot: "here the practice of institutionalisation continuously needs phantasmic imagination and dedication to the impossible, to actually make something possible" (Kunst, 2017).

As immensely productive for the process of thinking about artistic institutions (but also institutions in general) she proposes bringing two processes together – performative action (acting as if) and poetic capacity of invention (imagining as if not yet).

Sheikh (2011), on the other hand, suggests imagination and production of a new horizon, a new view, a new world:

> […] In other words, if the horizon is that which establishes a world- view, this is always a specific one that makes others not only invisible but even impossible.

> Having inherited the apparent endgame of liberal democracy and its adjacent politics of administration, it is an urgent task to attempt to go beyond resignation or empty critique and to insist that it is still possible to imagine another world. If another world is possible, how is it visible, not only in terms of realism but also the imaginary, and how it can be constituted as a horizon? […]. (Sheikh, 2011, p.20)

An institution or an institutional production must imagine a public in order to produce it, and to produce the world around it, a horizon. He questions the satisfaction of the institution or the modes in which we are presenting and practicing arts and culture, saying that if we are satisfied with the world we have now, we should continue to make exhibitions and works as always, and repeat the formats and circulations. On the other hand, if we are not satisfied with the society, the world, or the art world in broader geopolitical terms, we need to rethink the other subjectivities and imaginaries And, we have to be not only resistant or insurgent, but also instituent, he suggests (Sheikh, 2011, p.20).

Thinking in the present about the future must consider the conditions in which institutions are. Thinking about institutions in the present must also incorporate the "paradoxical conditionality of the institutions, the conditionality that we have to take into consideration especially in the present moment, characterised by institutional distrust on one side and institutional failure on the other (both actually coming from all political spectrums)" (Athanasiou, 2015 cited in Kunst, 2017). Athanasiou (2015 cited in Kunst, 2017) suggests that processes of institutionalisation or institutional engagement are possible in the persistence between fiction and reality.

The persistence between fiction and reality is possible if we deal with historicity through the present, or incorporate the past through the present perspective. The institution represents historical consciences, or within its ideological frame, it incorporates *historicity* – and

‘institutions remember or forget’ (Douglas, 1989 cited in Gielen, 2009, p.42). This is the logic that institutions such as museums or theatres are presented with or are living by, which does not have to be the logic of every institution of art. It leads to a heritage function of the institution or its responsibility towards what will be remembered or forgotten.

The production of historicity is a much criticized role, since such a role holds institutions back in promoting innovations, or provokes tensions between innovation and conservation, which is also related to inertia (Gielen, 2009, p.43). According to Gielen (2009), such a characteristic of the institution is featured at a meso-sociological level, at which curators (nomadic) or the biennale struggle against the institution (museum) as a societal phenomenon, or as an institution in a constant friction between the past and the present.

By providing the example of the biennale and curators (referring to them as nomadic, or not being a part of a certain institution, but presenting the post-Fordian or post-institutional frame), Gielen (2013) might be suggesting that the programming/curating methodology directly affects the institutional logic. He opens the question - is it a role of the institution to remember the history that is not encountered with contemporaneity? The institution should include the contemporaneity as a counter point to what has been done or produced in the history. The contemporaneity is “the other” to the history, as much as the history is “the other” to the contemporary art. This possible mirroring would enable critical reflection, and not only a diachronic, but also a synchronic trajectory to the art development.

The post-institutional model can be argued through contesting the institutional distrust and failure related to the political ideology in which institutions have performed their actions, bringing two processes together as Kunst (2017) suggests – performative action (acting as if) and poetic capacity of invention (imagining as if not yet). However, this cannot be

empirically tested as a managerial format, but it can be viewed as tactics through which institutionalisation can be performed.

The tactics of imagining and self-instituting, the performative action (acting as if) and the poetic capacity of invention (imagining as if not yet) can be viewed as tactics of the post-institution, where culture will also perform its public role. These tactics, as well as others (to be), should be part of the system where new *tools, tactics, norms, values, procedures, and methods will deal with things, and do things*.

Such tactics, which are producing a new horizon, are carried out in small or (still) not visible projects, festivals, workshops, platforms, collectives, networks that by being and doing are changing and shifting the paradigm from a heteronymous to a self-instituting position, from which the new world is not only imagined, but also executed.

The new steps towards - what to be done- can be found there. And, they are (to be): the heterogenic managerial approach should produce modes which are diverse and dispersed in scale, language, and content, symbolic and addressing the specific contextual needs, or working on the self-instituting.

2.5 Modelling the institution through visioning

As a science, among other issues, sociology studies structural formats or institutions through which the society and the life of the groups and the individuals in it are organized. It generally interprets the institution in *two directions*: *one is* as concrete organizations of people, things, infrastructure, and other (for example, for the institutions in art these would be theatres, galleries, museums, art centres, and so on, populated with people and art works), and *on the other side* it is extended in a system of values, protocols, norms considered as relevant

in the society (singular regime of values presenting ideological (state driven) norms, for example in a certain context where the institution is situated and driven by the political ideology of the state, even if it does not support it, it is affected by it) operating behind the institution. The art institution does not only imply location in physical format, but also praxes and discourses that recognize and consume something defined, perceived, or recognized as art, as well as principles supporting it. The institution of art is not only a formally organized space for production, distribution, and reception of art, but it also represents cultural, artistic, and social values and principles that support it.

> According to Bruce Cohen et al. (1990) a social institution is a permanently organised system for patterns of accepted behaviour and action to satisfy a societal need. Jonathan Turner (1997, p. 6) says that it is "a complex of positions, roles, norms and values lodged in particular types of social structures and organising relatively stable patterns of human activity with respect to fundamental problems in producing life-sustaining resources, in reproducing individuals, and in sustaining viable societal structures within a given environment. (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010)

On the other hand:

> North (1990) defines institutions as "the humanly devised constraints that structure human interactions. They are made up of formal constraints (rules, laws, constitutions), informal constrains (norms of behaviour, convention, and self-imposed codes of conduct), and their enforcement characteristics". In North's theory, formal rules are created by the polity, whereas informal norms are "part of the heritage that we call culture". Institutions, he says, are "the rules of the game. (Alesina and Giuliano, 2014, p.6)

We need to make a distinction of social forms which constitute elements of institution but are not institutions, such as rituals, social norms, social roles, happenings, and other. Some scientists are thinking of institutions as concrete forms, or closer to organizations (Osterberg, 1977 cited in Kangas and Vestheim, 2010) that are opposite to general arrangements such as family, marriage, religion, and other referred to as "societal formations" (Osterberg and Engelstad, 1995 cited in Kangas and Vestheim, 2010). Another distinction should be of:

> social forms that are more complex and encompassing concepts like for example for example cultures or societies. In any culture (in the anthropological sense of the concept) or society institutions are constitutive elements. In conclusion we may say that institutions are social forms "in the middle" – they are more complex and encompassing than for example norms and rituals, but less complex and encompassing than societies or cultures. (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010)

In the field of cultural studies, institutions are seen as blocks through which the social and political life is developed, and the institutional frame defines goals and shapes the means through which cultural interests and/or public interests in culture are determined (Žuvela, 2015, p.33).

As public spaces, institutions own a certain power that is both internal and external; however, their power is paradoxical, according to Athena Athanasiou, (2015 cited in Kunst, 2017). The paradox lies in the relation to the people, or the human beings, towards whom the institution has an obligation. On the one hand, the institution needs to sustain human beings, while, on the other hand, at the same time it can also be violent, it can destroy human beings, according to Athanasiou, (2015 cited in Kunst, 2017). She explains the complex relation of the institutions with the human beings and the precarity, or how "they can support us but also take us down by the constitutional violence which intrinsically belongs to every process of

institutionalisation" (Athanasiou, 2015 cited in Kunst, 2017). The constitutional or the conventional obligations that the institution has increase the precarity of the people in the institution, and also limit their autonomy in creation.

What Kunst finds crucial is:

> to always think about institutions through the specific temporal perspective: even if they are spatially bound, related to houses, shelters, domains, abodes, constructions and platforms, they should not be approached as facts, something which is given and completed, but only as potential processes, space of the institution appears because of the particular temporal constellation of forces. (Kunst, 2017)

Kunst (2017) suggests that institutionalisation is a never finished process, completed, but it has to operate between "performing the institution and resisting the very process of institutionalisation". Or, the institution can never be constituted, or referring to Athanasiou, (2015 cited in Kunst, 2017) - "we have to act in the process of institutionalisation as it would be possible, but at the same time, we also have to be always aware of what do we lose if we win".

Such a condition in a specific "political crack" in the political non-democratic context (corruptive, clientelistic system, or certain political crises), where nothing is permanent and is already temporary, or is always in-between such as Macedonia, is a contest. In political crises where institutions are derogated and are non-functional, the pragmatic aim -to develop functional institutions, or to stabilise institutions, is a prior. Such process of (re)constitution, forwarded towards the stabilization of the social system through institutional functionality can be interpreted as a constitutional violence that might stop the potentiality of instituting, as proposed by Kunst (2017).

What I gather, is that critical observation and imagination of the institution as a potentiality has to be protected with the political norms and organizational modes in order to enable a constant re-constitution of the institution.

Constitutional violence, as referred to by Kunst (2017), can uphold two dialectical stands in practice. On the one hand, the constitution of an institution enables certain cultural workers' and artists' unemployment to be regulated, and enables them to have basic working conditions, which is not the situation with the freelancers. On the other hand, norms and laws are structuring their working time and capacity in the precarity manner. An example of this is seen in the new laws regulating the working conditions of the artists in the public institutions through a position of service providers.

However, the epitome of precarity is the position of an artist or a cultural worker in the independent sector (especially in Balkan countries), not in the institutions.

On the other hand, institutions in Western Europe are facing populist and nationalistic cultural "reformations" erasing the public institutions, which, from the perspective of Bojana Kunst (2017), show how problematic the idea of the progressive institution is. This idea puts the institutions under pressure to produce and provide evidence of their "social and political" values, to fight the pressures coming from financial cuts and cultural reforms, and thus, turn themselves into good and obedient cultural agents. In such pressure, the constitutional violence and the precariaty become inevitable.

Furthermore, the immense disparity in economics plays a crucial role when discussing institutions, and this is directly related to the politics of economics and their influence in the institutional work, as well as the working conditions, programming, and other aspects constituting the institution in art.

Kunst (2017) suggests a radical shift in the temporal dimension of production, fighting the project logic, but allowing a multiplicity of proposals and imagination through which modes of work and thought are enabled, supported, and also sustained. She believes that the institutionalisation attempts should open a poetic process that is not an invention, but a specific form, visibility of production, and a form in which people can live together.

The institution, she suggests, has to be conditional, not a fact, or an achieved, finished act, but "a complex rhythmical loop between acting as if and imagining that which is not yet" (Kunst, 2017).

The proposal of the poetical invention to contest the shifts of the global political changes is a possibility of visioning and not a practical implementation of an institution as such, since the work of the institutions is always conditioned with financial mechanisms, or subsidiary politics of the party in power, or the decision makers. Here, practice, as a central concept in social sciences that refers to the structural and institutional framework of actions, as well as to the informal aspects of action, is not overviewed. Namely, such proposal by Kunst has to be extended through the organizational, management theory or cultural policy studies, in order to be articulated as reality.

To model an institution is to realize that vulnerability is larger if there are no economic politics to support the idea. Furthermore, modelling is also and always related to policy matters, or engagement of certain social authorities. I am not saying this to contradict Kunst, on the contrary, I support the ideological frame in which she operates, and I agree on the theoretical level. I suggest that the institution is where the reality of the context is implemented and/or contested. Therefore, when we think of the reformation of the institutions, we need to think through applying critical theory, but we need to relate it to the theories that include the operational realm. Institutions are organizational entities, forms of

exchange and implicit conventions, as also argued by Werner Hasitschka, Peter Tschmuck and Tasos Zembylas (2005, p.7)[8]. Therefore, the 'complex rhythmical loop between acting as if and imagining that which is not yet' has to contest and communicate different political, economic, and social influences.

Starting from the point that institutions are not historical constructs, Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas (2005) argue that their development has to be reconstructed. They say that in the wake of the establishment of a civil society in the 18th century, art and culture (production, distribution, and reception) became less controlled by the clerical institutions and increasingly imbued with meaning by markets and politics. Several social authorities and institutions have since exercised an influence on the formation of the cultural institutions' sphere (Zembylas, 1997 in Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas, 2005), and these social authorities include:

a) the legal system and cultural politics; b) the culture markets; c) the conditions of professionalism and production (education, technology, mentalities); d) media, art criticism, modes, public discourse on cultural affairs; e) institutions (such as museums, theatres, concert halls) that display, mediate, and convey an understanding of cultural goods and services. The influence of social authorities varies, and there is no hierarchical ranking based on the institutional function on the basis of which the interrelationships and interdependencies are formed. They also argue that the institutions are delivering the cultural goods, which is not a

[8] Werner Hasitschka, Peter Tschmuck and Tasos Zembylas (2005, p.7), argue that "institutions should not be exclusively identified with organizational entities (for example theatres, galleries, publishing-houses, music labels, etc.), but also with explicit rules (e.g. - legal norms, established professions)", which is similar to the examples before, but here they add the "forms of exchange (markets, social prestige), as well as with implicit conventions (behavioural patterns such as social roles) that form and stabilize professional practices".

> linear process, and this process is contingent (or, accidental, fleeting, and manoeuvrable). (Zembylas, 1997 in Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas, 2005)

In relation to social authorities, Pascal Gielen (2009) states that all art organizations are part of the art institution, but major institutions occupy the main part of it, and are expected to take the role, or to be the "guardian" or "facilitator" of values and practices, in other words, to be part of the social authorities. The accepted idea in sociology is that cultural practices have to keep in step with a powerful societal hierarchisation of values and norms (Gielen, 2009, p.42), which dominates and creates the influence that social authorities are distributing, or norming. Gielen (2013, p.14) also talks about the institutions as "verticalisation machines" which not only generate the imaginary height, but also a historical depth, a foundation to stand on. The reason is that they are always co-nstitutions, which spring from the community, a Latin 'con' or 'com' (Gielen 2013, 14).

Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas (2005) describe the approach towards cultural institutions from the perspective of their work *Cultural Institutions Studies* [9], which follows an institutional approach that differs from most of the functionalistic concepts within social and political sciences. They believe "that institutions do not only regulate social actions, but that they are also formed by social actions" Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas (2005, p.7). Their approach considers "that the social field of action, which constitutes institutions, is only a part of social practices in general. As Wittgenstein contends, institutions structure social action but they do not determine it" (Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas, 2005, p.7).

[9] "Cultural Institutions Studies" (a translation of the German term "Kulturbetriebslehre") which has recently been developed at the Institute of Culture Management and Culture Studies of the University of Music and Performing Arts Vienna. Cultural Institutions Studies synthesizes a cultural, sociological and an economic approach to cultural goods and services" (Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas, 2005, p.1).

What is problematic in their standpoint from my perspective is that they reduce cultural goods to market needs, or to simplify, they approach the institutions through the market logic as a prior perspective. They underestimate the power of the needs of a certain community of practice. They consider institutional functions in order to understand their social interrelationships and interdependencies, and view the influences of social authorities which also vary. They do not establish hierarchical ranking, and consider all authorities and institutions as polymorphic bodies, not reducing them to a fixed system or a formula. From such perspective, they draw two conclusions: "first, the formation of cultural goods is not a linear causal process, and second, this process is contingent (i.e. accidental, fleeting, and manoeuvrable)" (Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas, 2005, p.8). Viewing that contingency does not deny power-relations, they define that:

> In a metaphorical sense institutions inevitably operate as gatekeepers to organizational structures and social fields in order to generate a surplus value, to create scarcity, and to transfer cultural goods into commodities. Cultural institutions, therefore, administer the scarcity of cultural goods by excluding some artifacts and practices from further production, marketing, and reception and by including others. (Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas, 2005, pp.8-9)

By defining an institution only through the social authorities' interrelations and interdependencies, they are excluding the power of the cultural communities, or the communities of practice such as artists, cultural workers, and others who are directly involved into the modelling or the instituting of practices. Their interrelations with other social authorities or the power of the self-instituting cannot be underestimated.

They see the social authorities through normative, regulation forms, which are morphing the institutions where they act as a filter that enables or disables the economic and cultural

exploitation of artefacts and services, and create or prevent public visibility, according to them.

Taking into consideration the phenomenon of the scarcity of the market, they argue that cultural goods are not scarce per se, but if they are perceived as not freely disposable, scarcity emerges. The focus on market scarcity or its constitutive exchange function enables them to interpret cultural goods through their economic function, or argue that if cultural goods and services are perceived as scarce, they become commodities. What they offer is the market point of view that can derive the cultural goods to be in the form of commodities, regardless of their statement that then the symbolic function of cultural goods does not vanish. The function of the commodities loses its symbolic function, or its aura in the words of Benjamin.

They propose that the symbolic and the economic functions of cultural goods co-exist and should be analysed simultaneously, but the view or the perspective of the analysis determines the hierarchical level, or whether we employ the critical theory of a perspective or the market reality to what we adapt.

Here, I also consider approaches towards instituting, or do we employ a bottom-up or a top-bottom modelling approach. Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas (2005) give priority to social authorities (as top-bottom) valuations of cultural goods, rather than to the specific community of practice, such as the independent cultural scene, or the civil sector, or professionals practicing in the specific field.

The practice of the specific community of practice (groups of cultural and art workers in the civil society) is oriented towards an approach that is bottom–top/up, regardless of the fact that they are constantly facing the most rigid forms of top-bottom creation mechanisms. Such approach is formulated through the needs which are produced through the sociality of human

coexistence, or the co-existence of this certain community. Specific examples of such actions will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

Within the process of modelling, or visioning the institutional format, apart from considering the needs or the visioning of a certain community of practice, we also have to analyse the regulatory factors, or what is mostly described as the "social authorities" that do affect the reality in which an institution would emerge. However, I underline, such positions are not only taken as available, but also as a possible trait, trying to minimize it through critical reflection when approaching the visioning, or the modelling of a new institution.

As discussed above, heteronomity and historicity in instituting are holding back the institution from being re-invented. According to Gielen (2009), other factors are involved on a *meso-sociological* level as factors that hold back the innovation of the institution, and these are: fixed working hours, rigid differentiation between function units (artistic staff, educational department, public relations, maintenance, and management). This is a systematisation represented through the policy and nurtured as such. As regulatory factors, these factors do not provide the "open space" where the innovations can happen. Moreover, they cannot be articulated into some ideas or projects since they are restrictive. They are restricted through the frame they give and the protocols through which they are executed. These fordists regulative factors are opposing the post-fordian requirements of flexibility within the globally operating art world. The flexible working hours, the shift of the working positions, the mobility of staff, are on the other hand post-fordist factors that hold the immateriality in the working conditions, and are emphasizing the precarious position of the worker, but still, they are factors that the artistic world is aiming for.

2.6 Post-institution and post-managerial paradigm

As a term, post-institution can be observed differently from diverse perspectives. Gielen (2009) observes it from the point of view of the labor sociology that the immateriality in the working conditions is a factor that displays the hallmark of the post-institution (using the Delusian term to point out the jargonization of the same), such as the biennale. He also adds that even the museum, as the last example of the modernist, or rather the fordist example of institution, "is displaying post-institutional characteristics, for it too has become a Post-Fordian Enterprise"(Gielen, 2009, p.44).

He points that a post-fordian institution is a post-institution which, in its own capacities, describes all post-fordian characteristics.

On the other hand, Vesna Čopić (2011, p.27) talks about the post-institution as a step forward from the *paternalistic institution* into *modern organization*. In this context, she defines modernization as holding three important aspects: *political preferences, theoretical concepts, and feasibility and acceptability*. These factors are the ones that are restricting the modernisation of the cultural sector, pointing out the theoretical concepts for the public sector's reformation such as:

> New Public Management, based on market philosophy where funding is following targets, outputs, relationships are regulated through contracts, customers are in the heart of operation, there is a change of legal status towards greater autonomy, and the competition principle is applied through tendering and bidding. (Čopić, 2011, p.28)

She is stating that this concept should be taken with great caution.

The above mentioned concept of New Public Management is emphasizing the neoliberal ideology that stresses the market value, where the role of the managers, programmers in culture, or the professions managing the programs and structures in arts and culture, gets new highlighted values, or characteristics. This concept also emphasizes the verticality, and restricts even more the possibility to have the "open space" for innovations, rather than the organizational systems and formats of regulations or the immateriality of the working conditions. Moreover, such concepts are highlighting the fixed positions and communication of verticality that is the aspect of subordination and hierarchical positioning of the worker, which in cultural and art formations are not welcomed and not valued as positive, since they are producing circumstances that are not supporting the creation, but the generation of profit as a principal value that art should produce. Looking at it through the prism of the organization theory, such approach can be understood as a modernistic stand that gives the attention to one centre and reduces the complexity, creating a paradigm which favours rational structures, rules, and procedures as standardized and fixed, which will deliver desired outcomes and produce routines in the processes. It might seem that such policy can indicate a production of formats (organizations, structures, and governing models) that are inducing the stability of an institution, but such stability is not a concept related situation. Instead, its foundations are laid into the material support of the concept which can be independently formed. These policy implications are not motivated by the cultural concepts, but by the economic ones.

Čopić (2011) also adds that the *modernisation of the public sector* has to be motivated by a cultural rationale, and not by an economic one, and therefore, it has to based on the reaffirmation of the public value of culture, which according to her, means pursuing the better organization of culture as a public good.

> If the cultural mission used to be threatened by subordination to political ideologies, now it is subordinated to managers. While managers aim for financial stability, artists and other professionals aim for artistic enrichment. Managerial techniques, skills, and methods *should not be considered the substance but only in service of the substance*. Modernization should therefore reflect a post-managerial paradigm. (Čopić, 2011, p.28)

A post-managerial paradigm, according to Čopić, is found in the question - how to increase managerial discretion and authority without losing sight of the cultural mission? Or, in other words, how to be in a position that would strive for a substance and deliverance of new artistic expressions?

In the bases of the theories and logic of New Public Management driven by the political ideology based in the neoliberal concept, lays the creation of the post-institution paradigm – market above all, which positions the manager as a substance, and not in the service of a substance. Reformation of culture and art as public goods is only possible through a shift of the political ideology, or cultural reformation can be enabled by the reaffirmation of values that will enable the repositioning of the roles in which content and substance are created. In the concept of neoliberalism, the manager is an instrument for realisation of the profit and verification of the outputs and income. The suggested post-managerial paradigm by Čopić can be possible, or it is possible in a context where neoliberal procedures and actions are challenged, namely, the artistic contexts where the different values are promoted, and therefore, enable different professional positioning.

Čopić (2011, p.28) also talks about the "four fundamental **principles of institutional organization** that, on the one hand, suffocate managerial discretion and, on the other, enable the perception of public institutions as a legal obligation of the state in contrast to NGOs with no structural funding".

> First is the ***principle of hierarchy,*** where the public authorities are in the role of principal and the cultural institution in the role of agent. This is not a relationship between two equal contracting parties, because public authorities have founders' rights and therefore power over the institution. The second is **the *rule of law***. Discretion is reduced to a minimum, replaced by the paraphernalia of laws and instructions, budgetary appropriations, and regulations. The third is the ***principle of political neutrality***. Bureaucratic ethics are based on the belief that public servants follow the public interest. There is a presumption that selfish opportunistic behaviour or political partiality will be excluded and that the guarantee of political neutrality lies within a centralized system of public servants. The last one is the ***principle of accountability***, within which a public institution is treated as a so-called indirect spending unit in the public budget. The essence of traditional budgeting, i.e. a line item budgeting that is input-oriented, is control if the funds are spent as planned, while the evaluation of accomplishments is neglected. (Čopić, 2011, p.28)

The above cited principles are depicting the centralization of the political system, or the system of centralization that cannot allow modernization in the words of Čopić, the reformation of the public institution, or the shift of the post–institution into a post-managerial paradigm. The reformation of the public institution is only possible in the democratic society where the values and tools of democracy are developed, or where the social, economic, and cultural conditions will enable the free and equal practice of political self-determination, or more precisely, where direct democracy, and not representative democracy is in power, enabling the new decision models to arise.

In this aspect, new models of institutions that can be seen in the past period such as hybrid institution, common governing, collaborative model of governing, model of extended collaboration, new public culture, public spaces - public sphere models, and other can

challenge not only the economy driven models of governing, but also the traditional models of institutions, and become new examples of the post-institution in the post-managerial paradigm.

Čopič opens a position to re-think the principles as non-restrictive, or as principles that can create new meaning and a new post-institutional paradigm. Insisting on producing new principles should be a policy practice, or theorising their possible impact on the development of new models should be a tactic for change of the institutional paradigm.

The *principle of hierarchy can become a principle of shared ownership if public institutions are formed as bodies initiated by the government and stake-holders.* Here, the public authorities will be in the role of a partner supporting the bottom–up needs represented through the co-founder of the institution (association, organization, or other representing the users and stakeholders in the field). Founders will present a public partnership that will re-affirm the public value of culture, which is possible if the political ideology of the system supports the concept.

The *rule of law needs participatory methodology and should be related to the policy regulation through which it will always be reflected*. Laws in culture are not negotiated through policy instruments, and are not challenged by certain field findings. Laws should be redefined by the users, checked through the policy measures. New instruments and mechanisms of support should be constantly evaluated and reformed.

The policy should always be negotiated by the stakeholders and the users, those participating in the creation of culture as a public good. Involving the participatory methods (or usership) will allow the equalization of the positions and minimisation of the power of the centre, or the central position of the manager that is delegated through the centre. The manager position should be delegated by the decision communicated between the public authorities and the stakeholders.

The principle of political neutrality should be shifted to proactive participation, or through a shift of the bureaucratic ethics. The public interest is always changing, and therefore, it has to be reflected by proactive participation of the bureaucratic systems. There is no political neutrality, there is just opportunistic behaviour, or as Foucault says, there are technologies of normalization and control through which social relations take shape, provoking critical thought as independent of ideological or utopian models. The shifts and changes are possible through critical reflection where public servants are not neutralizators, but participators. I am aware that in the context of ex-Yugoslavia this seems as a utopian proposal, but insisting on the shift of the role of public servants should be present, visible, and defined as such.

The *principle of accountability* is to be shifted to the *principle of quality*, or shifting the paradigm that culture should be economized into reaffirmation of public good through culture, and evaluation of quality. Seeing culture as an indirect spending unit is part of the neoliberal ideology prioritizing measurements in profit, rather than in public goods such as education, socialization, development of critical thought, innovation, and other, which are directly investing in the social development that is an equally important merit in the society.

If the political ideology, or moreover, the system in which the political power is organized in one society is not a democracy system, modernization of the public art institution is merely impossible. Mikhail Bakhtin, through the notion of *chronotopy*, explains that time and space, as dimensions, are treated as symmetrical and absolutely interdependent. Time and space constitute the observation grid by means of which cultural products relate to the cultural context within which they are produced, as well as perceived (Gielen, 2009, p.96).

The mentioned model(s) of post-institution, where through the term we are acknowledging new aspects of governance such as participative, sociocracy, and deliberative democracy, are going to be explained in the subsequent chapter(s). Governance is a synonym for public management, and governance can also be seen as organizational governance. Therefore, here,

we comprehend three ways of governance/governing: 1. a public management (council, or decision making bodies), 2. governing structures (bodies within the public institutions), and 3. organizational governance.

2.7 Methodology and tactic towards modelling of new institutions – Internalisation of the critique and practices or a parallel agency of change

Nina Möntmann (2007) recognizes "new institutionalism" in the new intentions of the art community "to create "an active space" that is "part community center, part laboratory and part academy". She explains that she uses the term that Jonas Ekeberg, a curator who edited the publication "New Institutionalism", brought in the title "New Institutionalism"[10], defining this subject as an:

> attempt to redefine the contemporary art institution [...] ready to let go, not only of the limited discourse of the work of art as a mere object, but also of the whole institutional framework that went with it", stating that it was "far from peripheral, but rather central, even crucial, to the contemporary art scene. (Möntmann, 2007)

She also gives this example to underline that there are representative examples of institutions that have internalized the institutional critique as formulated by artists in the 70s and the 90s who helped to develop an auto-critique that is put forward by the curators. During this time, curators were playing an important role in the change of the institutional structure and function. From the mid and late 90s, curators are having a critical role towards globalized corporate institutionalism, as well as towards the consumerist audience.

[10] This publication was edited as part of the activities "of the Rooseum in Malmö, which – under the directorship of Charles Esche and later Lene Crone Jensen – was one of the model institutions of this new experimental and multi-functional approach to curating" (Möntmann, 2007).

The global changes in the 2000s and after, have influenced changes in these institutions followed by cut-downs of budgets that affected many institutions. Some were closed, and curators were displaced from others, as Möntmann (2007) says "have been put in their place like insubordinate teenagers". Smaller institutions were mostly suffering in this situation, or as Möntmann (2007) explains, only institutions that internalized and employed criticism and experimental programming were subject to cut–downs, closing or adaptations to the neoliberal economy. On the contrary, large sized - branded art institutions did not suffer any severe changes, but they adapted their way of working, adapting their structures and programming towards the market demands, or sponsors and politicians (for example, the Guggenheim).

This situation brings forward the question of new institutionalism again. Möntmann (2007) argues through several examples and agrees with the artist Gardar Eide Einarsson, who states, "It is a classical democratic problem, whether one should engage in order to change, or simply ignore in order to establish something else on the outside (the classical and in my view false distinction between alternative and oppositional)".

In her text, *Institutions as Sites*, Chantal Mouffe (2013) suggests that tactics proposed to act in a parallel system do not correspond to the newly formed situation of corporative institutionalism, but proactive changes need to be made in the structural frame, within the institution. She underlines:

> To believe that existing institutions cannot become the terrain of contestation is to ignore the tensions that always exist within the given configuration of forces and the possibility of acting for subverting their form of articulation. Contrary to this strategy of "withdrawal from institutions", the strategy I want to advocate is a strategy of "engagement with institutions". This strategy is informed by a theoretical approach that brings to the fore the discursive character of the social, and reveals how it is

> through a multiplicity of discursive practices that "our world" is constructed, a construction that is always the result of a particular hegemony. (Mouffe, 2013, p.66)

Another challenge is also suggested by Isabell Lorey (2013), where she provides an overview of the Occupy Movement as processes where new institutional practices are experimented. These practices bring forward the solution of another way of community, or are stimulating and encouraging a new way of living and communicating. Therefore, they are bringing new values and attitudes to be used as principles of working and living together. These processes are executed through a horizontal structure that slows down the decisions and communication, but brings new governing practices. However, Lorey (2013) proposes a verticalisation of these processes as a possible new way of instituting good practices, or changing the structures of the institutions.

On the other hand, through institutional critique, Milevska (2007) suggests a dialogical critique as a more appropriate model of institutional critique in terms of positive agency of action, instead of internalized institutional critique. She points out that:

> The internalisation of institutional critique is a two way street:-on the one hand institutions very quickly internalise the critique aimed and addressed to them: by appropriating the same vocabulary as their critics and by superficially incorporating the new structures, the criticised institutions become stronger although still continuing working under the same rules as before. An institution constructs itself only after being interpolated by a relevant critical opposition.
>
> - on the other hand critics themselves internalise institutional power by repeating their own criticism time and again, which then starts to rule their own activities, and thus they become gate-keepers and agents of a negation that is a different kind of power by using similar methods under the pretext of protection from the powerful institutions. (Milevska, 2007)

She arguments this with some examples from the 90s and the appearance of Soros Centres of Contemporary arts as a confrontation to the monopolized state governed institutions. In fact, many of these new initiatives or the critical counterparts were closely collaborating with the institutions, and she sees this as a threat of an even more centralised monopoly of power. In my understanding, she says that the internalisation of all critical power will strengthen even more the hegemony of the institution and will not allow diversity of opinion or criticality. She argues that such politics affects the art scene, since they pulled in all counter referents, and therefore, there will not be any counter referent to the institution that would offer an alternative to the other artists and institutions.

However, she also gives an overview of the new (post 2000) and relevant collaborations of several initiatives in the field of contemporary visual arts in the region: Kuda in Novi Sad, p74 in Ljubljana, WHW in Zagreb, Remont in Belgrade, as well as in Skopje: the Press to Exit project space, Tocka Cultural Centre, CK, and other projects. She considers them as examples of new programming, and production of art projects:

> that deal with institutional critique in a more positive and visionary way. Instead of critiquing, complaining or nagging, the new generation of artists and *artivists*, with the support of many different funding sources and foreign institutions, became aware that their committed art activities are perhaps the most productive institutional critique that may ultimately lead towards self-parrhesia. (Milevska, 2007)

Whether these organizations (Macedonian based) have succeeded to sustain these processes and how, I will discuss in subsequent sections, in the analysis of the organizations as self-organized temporary zones of critical reflections, related to the proposition by Möntmann (2007) in reference to the Western Europen context: “transgressive institutions that question and break with the current developments of privatization and simultaneously orient

themselves towards other disciplines and areas besides the corporative business of globalized capitalism".

I take this quotation as comparative analysis with the regional practices and institutional development in the Western societies. Möntmann (2007) relates such changes with the institutional development in the Western Society, and she suggests that:

> what institutions in western countries need to do is precisely to reduce the number of structures and standards, and disengage spaces from too many codes and contexts. […] This conceivable critical institution could, for example, take on the form of an internationally operating "organized network", which strengthens various smaller, independent institutions and activities – be they alternative, artist-run, or research-based – and could also set up temporary platforms within bigger institutions. (Möntmann, 2007).

Möntmann (2007) also proposes an *agency of action* instead of an internalized critique, as organized network, still proposing a link with the institutions, referring to it as a *temporary platform* that can be seen as common projects, or collaborative actions, which would enable the internalisation of some actions.

Such examples can also be seen in the civil society in the ex-Yugoslavia region. These organized entities can be formal or non-formal networks, platforms or projects whose strategies also include the temporary platforms with bigger institutions, or some formats of common activities. There are several examples of agencies of action that are new approaches towards institutional modelling based on the reformation of decision making models, such as the developed model of public – civil partnership of Pogon Croatia as the first example followed by different attempts of such modelling in other cities in Croatia, as well as other countries – Macedonia and Serbia.

What can also be detected here as another approach from the management perspective, is the reformation of the governing structure that enables more flexibility in the decision making and decentralized politics. Such model is bottom–up and serves the levels of sub-systems, or self-organized entities. This approach needs normative and policy adaptation, direct administration participation, and internalisation of the critique, as well as the principles, tactics, and procedures. The model will be overviewed in subsequent chapters, however, it depends on the normative and legislative system at the local and national level.

Möntmann (2008) proposes a new institution model in her lecture[11], by giving the example of what Alessio Antoniolli says is an ideal art institution for him, an institution that is not institution, or to paraphrase Kunst, an institution that is never constituted. Namely, an institution that would dismantle its political and strategic functions and be active outside of the governmental influence, working on destabilisation and stabilisation of the institution as a perpetual mode.

[11] Nina Möntmann, *Kako pripadati svojoj umjetničkoj instituciji*, lecture, Wednesday, 12.11.2008. at 19.00, G-MK | Galerija Miroslav Kraljević, Šubićeva 29.

3. Organizing institutional imagination or organizing the (post)institutional paradigm

This Chapter first provides the comparative analyses of institution and organization. It introduces the perspectives of the organization theory (the sociological and the management theory), and also the aspects of instituting, a system theory observation of self-organzation, as well as a review of its function in the field. It proposes a systematic overview of general models, or hereby referred to as the standard model and the collaborative model, or the map of development of diverse theatre institutions in the West and the South East. The author takes reference to these models arguing that these were the paradigm bases on which different new dance institutions or production houses supporting dance were established in Western Europe.

3.1 Organization and institution

To simplify the perspectives, an institution may be distinguished from an organization by defining institutions *as structures regulated by the social authorities*, and organization *as a group of people formed in order to achieve certain shared goals of individuals*. There are both similarities and differences that might be identified between an organization and an institution.

First of all, it is important to discuss what an organization or an institution represents.

According to general findings, institutions have to represent a certain ideology, or democratic values, or address certain functions and needs, while an organization is a social grouping established by a group of people who share the same values, needs, and so on. Therefore, it can be said that an institution's scope of function bears a larger societal goal, while an organization's scope of function is smaller.

What distinguishes an organization from an institution is the way of instituting, or how they are formed, and also, how open and inclusive they are. Another distinction is their public role, not in terms of the implications of the national political agenda, but whether they are autonomous, "public spaces", where social ties are created, and which have a role in the creation of the public sphere understood as a collection of attributes contributing to the formation of the public discourse.

An organization, as a structure, specifically in culture, should also have a role in the creation of a certain sphere, which is the public sphere in culture. If not, it can be an organization related to tourism, entertainment, leisure, or other.

It is necessary to analyse the distinction between an organization and an institution. Although these two terms are often used synonymously, they are divergent. This is to be contested since their functions have changed over time. However, it is necessary to approach this relation through theoretical perspectives.

Within the *theories of economics,* there are three different standpoints on how such relation is viewed: 1. The inclusion view 2. The distinction view (given by Douglass North), and 3. The assimilation view (given by John R. Commons). The first one, as the most frequent view, sees organizations as subgroups of institution; the second one sees them as interactive, but two clearly different categories, and the third "argues that organizations and institutions represent two facets of one and the same phenomenon" (Chavance, 2012, p.27). The third one, or the **assimilation view,** has been commented in the organizational theory of institutions developed by John Commons.[12]

Another theory that works on the internality of the institution is the *Organization theory,* which has been established as a social science since 1960. The theory is developed through

[12] The theory was developed in three important books: *Legal Foundations of Capitalism* (first published in 1924), *Institutional Economics* (first published in 1934), and *The Economics of Collective Action* (first published posthumously in 1950) by John R. Commons (Chavance, 2012, pp.27-28).

inductive modes (interpretative epistemology, establishing theory from practice), and *deductive modes* (positivist epistemology, testing theory against practice) (Hatch and Cunliffe, 2006, p.13). This theory includes both institution and organization, and establishes a pre-historic approach that has contributed to the development of the organization theory, which Mary Jo Hatch divides on two levels. This division serves as the formative conceptualisation of the organization theory, and the representatives' ideas served as references on which the organization theory perspectives were developed:

- one is sociological, focused on reshaping the organization and its formal roles in the society, as well as the influences of industrialization on work/labour, and its impact on workers (with its representatives: Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and Karl Marx), and
- the other is the management theory addressing the practical problems of managers working in the private and the public sector (representatives: Frederic Taylor, Henry Fayol, Mary Parker Follett, Luther Gullick, and others). The representing figures were executives or management consultants focused on the practical problems faced by the managers of the public and the private sector.

Many organization theorists regard the American sociologist Philip Selznick as the grandfather of the institutional theory. He based his theory on the observation that organizations adapt not only to the strivings of their internal groups, but also to the external values of the society. Elaborating on this idea, "the American sociologists Paul DiMaggio and Woody Powell argued that 'organizations compete not just for resources and customers, but for political power and institutional legitimacy, for social as well as economic fitness'" (Hatch and Cunliffe, 2006, p.86).

In this regard, Jo Hatch (Hatch and Cunliffe, 2006, p.86) distinguishes two directions by which she explains the demands of the environments over the organizations: one is technical,

economic, and physical demands to produce and exchange goods and services in a market or a quasi-market, and the other is social, cultural, legal, and political demands to play a certain role in society. The recognition of the external influence on organizations is a contribution of the institutional theory, and neo-institutionalists move beyond mere recognition of social and cultural foundations of the institutions to describe the processes by which practices and organizations become institutions. W. Richard Scott "defined institutionalization as 'the process by which actions are repeated and given similar meaning by self and others'" (Hatch and Cunliffe, 2006, p.87). According to this, not only governments, religion, or education can be defined as institutions, but also certain actions such as bowing, shaking hands… This is the ground of the definition of institutions in repeated actions and shared conceptions of reality. Powell and DiMaggio argue that activity patterns are supported by cultural influences (norms, values, and expectations), social influences (desire to be or to look as another institution), and political influences (laws). If the pressure comes from the government or laws, it is coercive institutional pressure, if it comes from cultural expectations, it is normative, and if it comes from a desire to look as another institution, it is mimetic (Hatch and Cunliffe, 2006, p.87). When the environment becomes organized around social, cultural, political, and legal expectations via these institutional pressures, it is said to have become institutionalized. Mary Jo Hatch explains that the difference between institutionalized and non-institutionlized environments can simply be a matter of rationality. She adds that in the institutional perspective, the environment is a culture that provides a shared view of what organizations should look like and how they should behave.

However, as mentioned in the previous chapter, a distinction has to be made between the social forms as institutions or "societal formations" (Osterberg and Engelstad, 1995 cited in Kangas and Vestheim, 2010) and institutions as a constitutive element of society.

> The relationship between an institution and an organisation can be summed up as an issue of the opposites between the general, the abstract, and the complete on one hand (institution), and the specific and the concrete on the other (organisation). In other words: **An organisation is a social and empirical representation or realisation of the concept of institution**. Organisations can also be defined **as 'materialised expressions' of the general concept of institution.** Typically, quite many organisations can be subsumed under one institution. At the same time we know that in everyday language practice people do not distinguish clearly between institution and organisation since there is a close connection between the two. (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010)

"A typical feature of institutions is that they are relatively permanent, which means that to become institutions, they must be functioning over time (Weber 1947; Parsons & Smelser 1956)" (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010). Or, in other words, time and permanence are components that are related to whether a certain form of an organised activity is an institution or not.

"In the cultural field, we can talk about *traditional* cultural institutions like theatres, operas, archives, libraries, museums, galleries, etc., and we take it for granted that they are institutions" because they have a long history and they are marked by permanence and stability (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010). The question is if an experimental theatrical group that has performed for five years is an institution, or a cultural organization established 15 years ago, working permanently and being part of the public sphere, producing public discourse?

It can be seen that "there are no standard answers here because different times and different societies have disparate opinions on how long time it takes to establish an institution"

(Kangas and Vestheim, 2010), or what are the criteria under which a certain organization, even a festival or an event, can be institutionalized.

Stability, or permanence, is among the desired conditions for an institution to be in. A historical institutionalism is opting for it in institutional theory. The issue of security is a desired one, since it provides the possibility of consistency that allows movement, dynamics, or possibility for differentiation. Raunig would indicate this in comparing institution to a project – "[…] the concept of 'institution' implies a desire for long-term duration, continuity and security, the concept of 'project' by contrast implies limited duration and the negative effects, such as precarization and insecurity, associated with it" (Raunig and Ray, 2009, xvi).

How to sustain stability, or sustainable conditions, when institutions are dependent upon the social authorities and the social environment? Their goal is to meet societal goals, expectations, and functions, both internally and externally, in order to legitimise their existence.

The stability or instability of an institution is also related to the architectural and spatial typology, also being used as strategic instruments for urban planning and marketing, giving them the role to reactivate the cities and regions (the phenomenon Bilbao effect).

Institutional spatial typology is related to the model of the present institution. For instance, institutions referring on the traditional model represent a highly controlled environment, a hermetically closed and neutral interior of a stable building. They present a *stable environment* that operates in a double sense: it guarantees the hermetic programming and social structure of an institution, and it directly depends on the potential of architectural elements (walls, ceiling, or floor) and their inherent capacitates to control the neutral condition. On the other hand, the alternative spaces are focused on spaces that blur into the everyday of the city: institutions with changing, dynamic boundaries, or *unstable institutions*, are in relation to the context of the city and its changes are related to the citizens, the users.

Stable institutions are mostly used as tourist sites and urban toponyms, or instruments for marketing rather than spaces for artists, cultural workers, and the community (Hirsch et al., 2006, p.50).

Another distinction between institutions and organizations is found in the decision making systems through which power is distributed. The traditional institutions' role structure or vertical hierarchy is an organizational mode, which is not as such in the organizations, or they can be organized through diverse systems, such as self-organized, horizontal or spiral hierarchy, and other, and depend on relations between persons, or they can even develop media of collaboration such as friendship, togetherness, mutuality, and so on. They have different roles which are interdependent.

In the institutional theory, there are at least three different perspectives proposed by Kangas and Vestheim (2010), through which the cultural institution can be reviewed. These include **rational choice**, **sociological** and **historical institutionalism.** [13]

[13] "**According to the rationalist approach**, institutions are intentionally and deliberately created or changed in order to increase efficiency, and the creation of institutions is understood as a quasi-contractual process marked by voluntary agreement among actors. **According to the sociological approach,** permanence or change of institutions is not just a functional response to the demand for economic or technological efficiency, but, for example organisations can adopt any practices that are considered by their institutional environment as appropriate or legitimate even if these practices do not increase organisational efficiency (taking into account also informal constraints and culturally self-evident world views). **Historical institutionalists** have suggested that institutional change occurs in path-dependent evolutionary ways. Institutions reflect historical cycles. When institutions have been established through various struggles and negotiations among organised groups, they have a continuing effect on subsequent decision-making and institution-building. Path dependence with power relations instantiated in existing institutions is an important effector and explains the persistence of institutions and policies over time. […] In **contrast to rational choice and sociological institutionalism, historical institutionalists are more 'eclectic'**" (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010). They do not make definite assumptions about the relationship between institutions and individuals, and they also relate the institutions to the power and power distribution. Furthermore, they are associated with the "image of social causation, which is 'path dependent' in the sense that it "rejects the traditional postulate that the same operative forces will generate the same results everywhere". Instead, historical institutionalism claims that "the effect of such forces will be mediated by the contextual forces of a given situation, often inherited from the past"" (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010).

"Path dependence is a substantive notion in the diachronic approaches to understanding social and political processes. The notion **means that the evolution of institutions, organisations or practices does not necessarily follow the logic of efficiency**. […] **Much of the discussion of path dependence is that the same programs are being implemented year after year, and that the institutions** involved in that implementation also persist across time. […] Being critical to the definitions where **path dependence** means **"that what has happened at an earlier point in time will affect the possible outcomes of a sequence of events occurring at a later point in time"** (Sewell, 1996, pp. 262-263)" (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010).

"However, the conception of "same" may itself be variable, and although what is implemented may be close to what was implemented in the previous time period, the level of reproduction will almost certainly not be perfect. The most important of these is the role of **perception and interpretation** of the actors within the institution. **A number of scholars have argued that historical institutionalism has weak assumptions of agency**, **and tends to ignore the importance of actors in the process of maintaining the path** (Peters, Pierre & King 2005)" (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010).

"**The question of what a path dependent policy is […]** remains an open and empirical question for researchers applying the concept. At the heart of **any account of path dependence is stability**. **Observations of change** challenge the notion. At the same time, **this is a common criticism of the historical institutionalists' school, "in its emphasis upon path dependence and historical legacies it is rather better at explaining stability than change"** (Hay 2002, p. 15)" (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010).

"Thelen (1999) argues that **path dependence is also too deterministic in that once the initial choice is made, then the argument for future development becomes mechanical**. […] In terms of policy studies, one possible counterargument is based on the interpretation of stability in path dependence. Specifically, the notion does allow policy change; policy legacies constrain rather than determine current policy.

Policy does change, but within a particular set of options for change; thus the policy may be said to exhibit stability. As such, policy change is often characterized by moments of crisis (Hay 2002)" (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010).

Mahoney and Thelen [13] **have "emphasized an evolutionary model of how institutions change,** in which **change is more gradual and indeed resembles incremental adjustments**" (Kangas and Vestheim, 2010). They offer five broad modes of gradual, but transformative changes: displacement, layering, drift, conversion, and exhaustion.

Displacement – change can occur through displacement. In the "new' institutionalism in sociology, displacement happens as new models emerge and diffuse, which calls into question existing organizational forms and practices. Institutional frameworks are never coherent. **Layering** refers to modifications to institutional systems that are added to an institutional form, rather than replacing an existing structure. It means using existing institutions for new or alternative purposes. In either case, the original choices are likely to figure heavily in the current functioning of the institution. Thus, institutions will rarely look like optimal solutions to present collective action problems. **Drift-** institutions require active maintenance, and there is nothing automatic

3.2 Strategic planning and decision-making in organizations and institutions

Institutional or organizational change is also related to strategic management, a term that Lidija Varbanova (2013) sets as an analytical and practical process, explaining that strategic management is used interchangeably with the terms corporate strategy, business policy, and strategic planning. In 1957, Igor Ansoff, known as the 'father of strategic management', proposed a matrix of four main strategies (Varbanova, 2013, p.25)[14] that later became widely used in the practice of strategic business management. Peter Drucker later introduced new ideas in management theory such as the idea of decentralisation, the importance of workers as 'assets' in an organization, the view of the corporation as a human community, the importance of customers for business development, the concept of 'knowledge worker', the theory management by objectives (MBO), and other. Furthermore, Alfred Chandler recognized the long-term strategy as important for a company's structure, direction, and focus. In addition, Michael Porter offered three generic strategies for achieving and maintaining competitive advantage for a company: cost leadership, differentiation and market segmentation, and many other 20th century approaches of the management theory (Varbanova, 2013, p.24).

Most of the research on strategic management and planning considered the business sector, following the business dynamics and focusing on the business organizations.

---

about institutional stability. They need to be re-set and refocused and sometimes re-calibrated and refocused. **Conversion –** (redirection of institutional resources) is different from layering and drift. Institutions are re-directed to new goals, functions, or purposes. This might be a response to environmental challenges, or power relations. The fifth mode, **exhaustion,** is related to breakdown of the institution rather than change, and differs from institutional drift "in which institutions may retain their formal integrity even as they increasingly lose their grip on social reality, institutional exhaustion is a process in which behaviours invoked or allowed under existing rules operate to undermine this".

[14] Market penetration, market development, product development, and diversification.

The first attempts to apply the strategies in the public sector were in the period between the 1960s and the early 1970s. In 1970, Anthony Catanese and Alan Walter Steiss emphasized the need for a more systematic approach to public decision making, stating that planning is a prerequisite for effective management whether in the private or the public sector. A pioneer in introducing planning models in the non-profit sector was John Bryson in 1995 (Varbanova, 2013, p.26). The introduction of strategic thinking or planning in the art sector appeared several decades ago as a separate area of research and the literature is divided in functional areas. Most publications exploring theories on art management and cultural administration deal with the non-profit and subsidized organizations in the cultural sector, and the importance of knowing how to manage internal aspects and organizational development. Another group deals with the macro-level and essence and development of the cultural policy tools and mechanisms, as well as matters in cultural economics and creative industries (Varbanova, 2013, p.28).

Strategic planning in arts and cultural organizations from the civil society in the ex-Yugoslavia came with the international foundations or donators, or was imported through the foundations which at one point decided that investing into the organizations in culture has to be more sustainable, but it also has to be measured through different indicators than a project. Such approach from the foundations was marked with certain grant lines for infrastructural development, an approach that enabled the organizations to develop in a more sustainable way. This was also due to the decision making and organizational governance structure of the organizations where reactions are prompt; communication is immediate and procedures are supporting the immediacy. Organizations in culture (civil) became a more constitutive societal element than institutions, since they started analysing, planning, monitoring, and evaluating. All these aspects allow civil society organizations (many of them) to become relevant societal forms where certain discourses related to norms and values are produced and

developed. On the other hand, provisionally, it can be said that institutions were the opposite of organizations and their relevance in the field and relation to the society was weak.

In their book, *Art Management in Turbulent Times: Adaptable Quality Management*, Milena Dragićević Šešić and Sanjin Dragojević (2005) deal with the specificities of the cultural sector in turbulent political and economic circumstances, offering concepts of strategic development and planning management tools for arts and cultural organizations. They relate strategic management to the introduction of new methodological framework and sustainable strategies that can be applied in a climate that allows and supports innovations.

Strategies or tactics of action are inscribed in the context in which they are effectuated. Different processes in arts and culture have their own specificities and they are actualised through diverse actions and in various contexts. Therefore, we cannot talk about a single strategic planning, or set of preconceived strategies, but we need to consciously address the specific context in which a certain organization or institution is situated, as well as its programation direction.

In certain contexts, due to political turmoil, inconsistence, clientelism, and other, we can rarely plan, or create strategic plans that can be implemented. It can be said that in such environments, it is the creation of tactics followed by step-by-step planning that gives more visible results and can address the frequent and turbulent changes (political, economic, normative, and other), rather than the strategic planning. A tactic allows imagining the positions in which the specific idea would be executed.

Apart from strategic planning, decision making processes, or models of governance and governing and managerial paradigm, have to be contested. The role of the managers has to be considered not as the substance, but only in service of the substance, as Čopić (2011) argues, or a position that is shifting according to the desires, needs, or negotiated ideas. The manager or the one who manages, governs, and develops the organizational paradigm of governance

becomes the “art arranger of imaginary actions”, the co-creator of new meanings and substance, not being the subject of governing, but of co-governing with the co-creators. Co-governing can also be seen as part of the participatory governing process, or as a managerial position that allows the manager, and similar professions in art that are forming regulative systems in which the art substance is generated, such as curator, programmer, and other, to negotiate their positions.

Imagining the institution can become the tactic of imagination, which can be a managerial - heuristic tool, part of the self-organizational process allowing arrangements through experiment, where positions are changing, or where by doing – the instituting can happen.

Managerial theories supporting such process are found in the systems theory that works beyond the boundaries of organizations influencing the management outlook, the external environments, or within the system theory, the capacity of the system to make its own structure more complex is called self- organization (Meadows, 2008, p.79).

3.2.1 Self-organization as governance and decision-making

> Self-organization is often sacrificed for purposes of short-term productivity and stability. Productivity and stability are the usual excuses for turning creative human beings into mechanical adjuncts to production process. […] Or for establishing bureaucracy and theories of knowledge that treat people as if they were only numbers. […] Self-organization produces heterogeneity and unpredictability. It is likely to come up with whole new structures, whole new ways of doing things. It requires freedom and experimentation, and a certain amount of disorder. These conditions that encourage self-organization often can be scary for individuals and threatening to power structures. […] System theorists used to think that self-organization was such a

> complex property of systems that it could never be understood. […] New discoveries, however, suggest that just a few simple organizing principles can lead to wildly diverse self-organizing structures. (Meadows, 2008, pp.79-80)

Consequently, Meadows (2008) proposes that in a process of creating new structures and increasing complexity, one thing that a self-organizing system often generates is hierarchy. In the system theory, understanding the world in organized sub-systems aggregated in larger sub-systems and the arrangement of those systems is called hierarchy. The hierarchy principle in the cultural system, or the sub-systems, can be *heteronomous* or autonomous in Bourdieu's terms. The self-organized structure is situated in the autonomous. In the sub-systems, relationships are denser and stronger than the relationships between the two sub-systems.

"The original purpose of a hierarchy is always to help its originating subsystems do their jobs better. This is something, unfortunately, that both the higher and the lower levels of a greatly articulated hierarchy easily can forget" (Meadows, 2008, p.84).

Hierarchical systems should be evolving bottom-up and should serve the lower levels, which is also often misused, and therefore, non-functional to the purpose.

The system theory is defining a system as a set of components that interact with one another and serve for a common purpose or goal, or "A system is an interconnected set of elements that is coherently organized in a way that achieves something. […] a system must consist of three kinds of things: elements, interconnections, and a function or purpose" (Meadows, 2008, p.11). A system can be (1) abstract, as conceptual, or (2) physical, as a product of the human mind. Through the system theory, social, theological, and cultural systems are abstract systems, existing as ones to be discussed, studied, and analysed. On the other hand, the physical system has a material nature, based on material rather than ideas or theoretical notions.

The self–organization of the system in contemporary culture is familiar as a practice of the independent or the civil society organization of groups, projects, and organizations, as an alternative organization form. The subject of organizing systems of work, production, or processes of creation in the field of civil society becomes crucial, especially in transition societies such as the ex-Yugoslavian context. The Walking Theory magazine Self-organization issue No. 11 was dedicated to the presentation of such practices in the ex-Yugoslavian and European context, as well as having the aim to encourage articulation of a model, or models of self-organization. By this, self-organization was not taken merely as a production-management model, but also as a theoretical problem and an artistic-poetic position reflecting on procedures of work and cultural policy issues, as Ana Vujanović (2006) reports in her text *Self-organization: Notes on the subject-matter of the conference*.

From the aspect of the management theory, or as explained in the system theory, the notion of self-organization in culture and art can also be articulated as a sub-system that is created "from the bottom", and mostly at a point when cultural policies and institutional policies are created "from the top".

The establishment of the new self-organized structures is in connection with the dissatisfaction of the cultural protagonists from official policies created top-down. Self-organized initiatives are rooted in the civil sector and are created from the needs in the arts and culture field. They are bottom-up initiatives, which are diversified, heterogenic, and dissatisfied with the position in the cultural system, especially in relation to the institutional principles and protocols of work (all systems that create and support culture and art, including Ministries of culture, city administrations, managers and programmers of large institutions, and other). Their aim is to re-invent the institutional and collaboration protocols and principles, and as Vujanović says: "to rethink the place, the status, and the functions of art and culture in the public sphere of this restructured "global" society" (Vujanović, 2006, p.63).

They are connected with the specificities in different contexts, pursuing various goals, strategies and tactics, having different capacities, and as Vujanović (2006) argues, they share the starting point, which is: to a certain degree – preserving the art from the direct interference of either the market or the state.

As mentioned above, the term *self-organization* is connected with the systems theory, presenting the complexity of the system itself. It has not been guided by any outside system, but it refers to the specific needs of the inside dynamic, and therefore, creates a particular and an even more unique model that would address its own needs. Self –organization is not a disorganized or not organized system, but a system that enables a generative approach, and that enables the creation of a specific model of governance or collaboration, its own protocols, procedures, tactics and methods of work. It is flexible, in the sense that it always refers to the internal dynamics, having knowledge and relations with the external systems. However, even the communication and the relations with the external systems are created with the respect of the own produced values and ways of work, therefore presenting a certain attitude towards the social reality. These self-organized systems are adverse to the public institution models, which are mainly based on a very precise systemized hierarchy mostly misused in its own function. Therefore, politically, self-organization can be seen as model of resistance to the existing institutional models of organizing, or it can also be seen as an alternative or possible model to be instituted.

Hierarchy in the self-organized sub-systems can be developed under the autonomous principle of hierarchization in Bourdieu's terms, which does not recognize the laws of the market as the measure of success, but the recognition from the other actors in the particular cultural field.

Self-organized systems can be characterized with flexibility, openness to new ideas, flow of communication, solidarity, and generativeness. Self-organized systems are a generic set of

tools, procedures, tactics, and even more protocols, as well as a space or a field of produced knowledge and values.

Such systems correspond to art and culture as fields of invention and transforming potential, based on innovation, experimentation, research, and search for change to allow their transforming potential to intervene in social relations. It can be possible for an organization model to be instituted into a hierarchy (in system theory terms) that would allow multiple self-organized, rhizomatic sub-systems to communicate their dynamics and generate the needed ideas.

In a self-organized system, all protagonists are sharing the principles that are based on common ownership and responsibilities, where the decision making process is shared, with proactive participation and respect for the quality of work. Also, "the will", in Rancière's terms, determines the position of the protagonists and their role in the participation process, as well as the potential of such system. Therefore, a self-organized system does not subordinate, but it addresses the certain potential. Moreover, it can be seen as a system of choreography, or to relate Marten Spangberg explanation on choreography:[15]

> Choreography is a matter or organization, of ordering and making stable, although stability is many things. Choreography's first enterprise is to domesticate movement. Choreography is concerned with structures and structuring […] Recently the term choreography as expanded practice has been used emphasize how organization is non-linear to expression, choreography to dance and that choreography needs to be considered a cluster of tools that can be used both to produce and analyze autonomous

[15] I make this referrence to choreography since much of the inspirational thinking, reflecting, or discussion about structure, organization, collaboration, self-organization, self-education, and so on, comes to me from here. It is a certain observation strategy or comparative analyses of micro to macro, from dance/performance to the structures of organizations, from the institution/organization to the system of society.

> to expression, i.e. choreography has become a generic set of tools, a technology or a field of knowledge. (Spangberg, 2014)

Self – organization can be seen as choreography of working conditions, a set of tools, competences, and knowledge that can produce the dynamics to be generated into new knowledge and certain outcomes, from the inside, from the needs. It can be the stabilization that can be destabilized by its own dynamics, to become stable again.

Supporting self-organization does not mean that art is not related to the social context, or that I am suggesting an isolated system that would not correspond to the social reality. On the contrary, here, I also try to address art as a social practice and as a political activity that can project and imagine, analyse a new social reality. Processing the possibility of instituting self-organized sub-systems into a model of institution is also a political act, and a possibility to intervene in the social reality that corresponds to the same characteristics of art.

Ana Vujanović (2006, p.64) concludes: "it could be that the self-organization is just one more artistic r/e-volution, like those we know from that "other" history of art which maps the practices from historical avant-gardes to late-post-modern critical art in the age of culture". This was the question of the conference in 2006 – whether these r/evolutionary projects remain unaccomplished or keep opening new spaces.

From the distance of almost ten years, and many different projects, initiatives, networks, platforms, and programs developed on the subject of self-organization, or on the model of self-organizing, it can be said that this is still a relevant discussion topic, and also that it can be witnessed that such approach allows the opening of new spaces. [16]

[16] These examples will be examined in subsequent chapters, as case studies of organizations, networks, platforms.

Besides having examples of such initiatives operating locally, we can also witness the emergence of regional[17] initiatives such as networks and platforms that were being formed on the basis of self-management.

If we want to trace the emergence of such initiatives, we can go back to the organization in Yugoslavia where self-organization, or self-management, were postulates of the governance. We can say that such approach in the governance is the legacy from the old Yugoslavian system that has been transferred through memory or through way of behaviour, or even more so, a need to express.

The dissolution of Yugoslavia as a federal state brought many changes, social, economic, and political. In the 1990s, in the already existing countries, the institutions from Yugoslavia were reformed as national institutions, preserving the functioning, but increasingly centralising the system and the governance.

With the fall of the Berlin wall, the era of the Cold War symbolically ended and it brought big socio-economic changes. The transition from socialism was very turbulent, especially in the transformation of public to private properties of the state(s), which did not put the states in a better position. We have witnessed criminal processes, lots of unemployment, inequality, and discrepancy in working conditions, payments, and so on. What has happened and what we can witness is a change of the system from state to market capitalism, in terms of the Frankfurt school, or these countries have entered the geo-political sphere, where different needs, ways of social production and control are addressed. In such situation, states have

[17] Defining the region in the context in which I write this thesis is essential, especially in relation to the political terms used to define the region of ex-Yugoslavia in the past 10 years, deferring from South Eastern Europe, to Western Balkans, and other. Since these administrative and political namings were/are not suitable for practices and initiatives emerging in the region of ex-Yugslavia that includes some bordering countries, many of them have defined the region descriptively or by using words such as Balkan, ex-Yugoslavia plus Albania, or Bulgaria, and so on. Or, simply defining a region through the existing cultural collaborations and social capital. However, here, with the region I am addressing the collaborations in the ex-Yugoslavia, and if there is involvement of another country in a certain example, I will specify it.

created a policy that is related to the geopolitical given directions, and that does not necessarily concern itself with the creation of autonomous space for art and cultural production.

With such reconstruction of the socio-economic, political, and cultural systems, encouraged to democratise the context, a new sphere has been recognized, a public sphere created by the civil society. The civil society in ex-Yugoslavia started to develop with help and transfer of knowledge and know-how from European context, supported through international donations. In Kjosev's words, it was a period of self-colonisation. Capacity building programs and workshops in specific spheres in civil society were implemented, and many actors were educated to skill their knowledge for work in the civil sector. The end of the 90s and the beginning of the 2000s were marked as years of the formation of new civil organizations, as counteraction to the institutions. In the middle of the 2000s, they marked their position as an independent scene, accenting the political, programmation, and governing independence from specific outside sector, or centre. From this aspect, they can also be seen as self-instituted, in Sheikh's terms, and self-organized since they have generated the structure from bottom oriented to internal dynamics of the organizations, rather than to some externally nominated position.

These organizations are also marked with a trans-disciplinary approach in the programs, and an integration of different actions characterized with social awareness, activist tactics, and development of different modalities of collaboration and exchange which bring forward different narratives of the identities.

Ana Vilenica (2006, p.102) proposes possible models of self-organization in the art practice, arguing that self-organization is appearing, in reference to contemporary art practice in the countries of the ex-East Block, as a possible method for the creation of autonomous spaces in

which critical practice and visibility can be enabled, as well as a method that would enable the existence of the artist in such space.

Created spaces, which can be seen more as independent rather than autonomous, activate new procedures and protocols in their organizational work in order to reorganize and activate the space.

3.3 Models and modes of institutions and organizations in performing arts

Traditional institutions in culture are mainly state institutions, representational, and they are functioning according to the principle of excellence in a particular domain. If traditional institutions are state institutions, they represent state political directions, but they also protect the values in the particular field with the aim of institutionalizing them. Values in a particular artistic field are changing and are based on the development of a paradigm supported by research, theoretical work, and aesthetical reflection. This paradigm can also be the "artworld", understood in Danto's and Dickie's terms, or what defines the art is the "artworld", or the art sphere, to which the art domain institutions belong. Art can be understood as institution itself, which is what Dickie and Danto did by the introduction and the development of this term.

"At bottom it implies that 'to see something as art requires something the eye cannot decry – an atmosphere of artistic theory, a knowledge of the history of art: an artworld", as Arthur Danto explained in his article *'The artworld'* (Danto, 1964, p.580 cited in Vujanović, 2015, p.30).

The artworld is an institution, and that means that art is a social good, and not an external practice to be later institutionalized. It is a social practice that is presented in public spaces and shaped by certain rules, protocols, procedures, and conventions that also belong to the particular spaces where art is presented. Art is an established practice that changes, and therefore, its rules are permeable, or it can change due to direct changes in the art world. Art is a loose institution, as Nöel Carroll will later formulate (Carroll, 1999, pp. 233–4 cited in Vujanović, 2015, p.30), which does not mean that its procedures are easy to change.

> It rather indicates that although the acts and decisions about the status, value, visibility and historicity of art works, practices, notions and even artists that are made by the actors of artworlds are formative, they do not have juridical but – performative – power. (Vujanović, 2015, p.30)

Art's performative power is articulated through the public spaces, the cultural and art institutions, the organizations where the paradigm is developed. Such paradigm also presents a classification system, or a value system related to the art field. Every paradigm develops a system of hierarchy relationships between the practices in the field (traditional, new, or drama theatre, experimental, post-drama, physical, dance-theatre, and other). Dance belongs to different hierarchies in different policy systems. For example, in Macedonia, it belongs under "stage arts", of which theatre and music are also a part. Classifications, or value institutionalizations, are operating internally, as well as externally with the audience and the art and cultural world. These classifications are formal, and the audience is communicated through them, or they expect a certain artistic work to be presented by a certain institution, but also, these aspects are formalizing protocols of behaviour or implicit conventions.

Therefore, the institutions enable a certain experience of art in a familiar manner. How to prescribe the experience to those arts which are questioning the familiar, or the known, trying to change the art context and the social context? We can consider the museum of

contemporary art in the family of museums that (should be) is continuously oriented to the critical reflection of art, or the question of historicity, temporality, artistic conventions, art organizations, society, societal conventions, systems of work, distribution of work, wealth, education, and other.

Therefore, it is not a mainstream and it never should be, but it should be the institution that would encounter new social standards. Indeed, the museum of contemporary art is often seen as dysfunctional because the larger population still expects order, classification, or conventions to which it can respond. Although the order in museums of contemporary art certainly exists, most of the population does not recognize it, since people do not recognize the conventions and the values reflected in the work of the museum. Or, they do not belong to the recognizable paradigm, or the socially accepted standards.

Museums of Contemporary Art are determined with the classification system of visual arts, and not with divergent social practices. Therefore, when they start including divergent practices, the classification system has to be adapted. However, classifications, or norms, also have to be socially accepted or introduced to be accepted.

In a comparing manner, when talking about the dance institution, or the contemporary dance institution in the family of dance institutions, a distinction should clearly be made between the mainstream dance, or ballet, and the divergent dance practices, or the representational and discursive dance institution, in order to produce classifications.

3.3.1 General models – standard model and collaborative model

The appearance of the avant-garde, or post-dramatic theatre, the performance art in visual arts, the postmodern dance and the minimalistic dance, as well as the conceptual, have

diminished the field borders by bringing forward common or shared interest, rather than difference. The common interest to all is the aspect of performing, as well as the body. These aspects extended the formal positions in which these art forms were creating, and consequently influenced the reformations of the models in which the art forms were developed, organizations and institutions.

The performing arts world has changed, and more precisely, the dance world, especially in the past decade. Today, for instance, we are witnessing the entrance of contemporary dance in museums, an art form that does not seem to hold a specific institutional format. Being a diverse art form in processes of research and creation, dance, as an art form, is organized through different institutional models such as dance companies, studios, theatres, production houses, dance houses or centres, and other (organizational models and institutional frames). All these can be divided in representational or traditional models, and discursive models, or those producing a new dance discourse and a paradigm. The traditional models can be state institutions, companies, or private, private-public, or delegated governance institutions, and other.

Methodologically, I have decided to make a diachronic relation with the theatre institution, since dance is largely a part of the "stage art", where hierarchically, the theatre is at the top (politically and socially) and dominates not only through financial, infrastructural, or other capacities, but also through multiplication of the institutional mode. This does not mean that in the dance field we have the same models as in the theatre, but we can have mapping of different theatre institution models, which have influenced the creation of (some) dance institutions.

On other hand, I will propose new (general) models of institution, or governing for contemporary (performing) arts.

I take Dragan Klaić's (2012) map of development of diverse theatre institutions in the Western and South Eastern context as a basis, by which we can note how the diversification of production processes in the theatre over the years brought up emerging trends and transformation options. I take reference to these models since I argue that these were the bases on which different new dance institutions or production houses supporting dance were established in Western Europe. Western Europe has a large influence on South – East Europe in this aspect, however, there were certain specific approaches developed in ex-Yugoslavia, which I will discuss in subsequent sections.

This mapping will enable us to note the distribution of different trends, as well their contextual impacts.

3.3.2 Standard model (traditional/mainstream, homogenized managerial structure)

Traditional or mainstream cultural institution model (homogenized managing structure, standard systematization of working places)

The model that might be referred to as a *"standard model",* or a homogenized managerial model, is a model organized through vertical hierarchy. It can mainly be found in the public model of a theatre, and repertoire theatre, as well as public production houses of theatre and dance. Furthermore, this model can also be found in commercial or private models of theatre and dance production houses, or other types of institutions, as well as some independent theatre and dance companies. This model of organizational management, or decision making, is related to a single figure, and that is the Artistic or Managing Director (sometimes managing at the same time), which has the decision making power on institutional level related to authorities such as a Minister of culture or a board. This is a model of top-bottom

decision making. It is based on the artistic preferences of an individual, or her/his aesthetic impetus, and somehow has the role of a curator, the one that takes care of the institutional and organizational frame, but also of programmation. In this decision making model, the Artistic Director is a centrally positioned figure in the vertical hierarchy, and is a central authority over the organization and programming. However, the artistic director is always conditioned by higher politics emitted either through a board whose members can be nominated by the Minister of culture or other instances of economic or political power which are controlling the budget and the program.

The artistic director or the central figure in the vertically systematized structure is under ideological pressures that are rarely permitting critical or reflective work to be programmed, since such work is often questioning the systems of power and their legitimacy.

In the varieties of this model, a managing director can be another figure with authority, however, this position can vary, or it can either be the same with that of the artistic director or lower, which means that the managing director follows the instructions of the artistic director. Such a model in the theatre or dance institution rarely challenges dominant modes of governing or organization, and institutional change. Such a model can be replicated and reproduced through many diverse model structures.

To move forward from here, we also need to inspect the functions of the models' structures in the public, non-profit, and commercial theatre spaces, which also include the specificities of repertoire theatres, alternative or independent theatre models, and production houses, and other.

3.3.2.1 Specifics of the standard-vertical-model and its varieties of public, commercial, and independent theatre

As mentioned above, the *standard model* can be found as a model of the public (theatre) institution in Western Europe, and it has its roots in the 19th century ideology of nationalism, being an ideological platform for the nation. The public theatre, as a nation state emblem, is related to the public commitment to exposition of the nation's existence and development. It is also a representative institution and a pillar of the nation state that, according to Klaić (2012), in some cases is paid for by the members of the national community in anticipation of a nation state that is yet to be created. Such are the cases with the Poles, Czechs, Serbs, Croats, and Hungarians, all of whom have articulated their national theatre projects as a preparatory phase for the emergence of their nation state. The Macedonian example can also be related to this group, however, not as a preparatory phase, but as a parallel integration of the nation narrative and identity built and rebuilt in the past through the national theatre.

Current public theatres are not only linked to the national theatres, but also to other city theatres and production houses, as well as private or alternative theatre organizations, and spaces formed by civil society organizations.

Public national theatres or city theatres are formed as *standard models*, as well as private ones where the centre of the decision making power is differently postulated, yet empowering a single central position. Although the alternative models of public theatre spaces are more oriented towards collaborative - horizontal – models, such examples are not many. The public function of the spaces has changed in the ex-Yugoslavian countries after the 90s with the development of the civil sector where new public actions, collectives, spaces, production houses were formed and experimented.

Klaić (2012) is connecting today's alternative models with the small venues of the Paris avant-garde in the 1880s and the 1890s, such as André Antoine's Theatre Libre (1887), where he inaugurated naturalism on stage supported by naturalist authors, including Zola whose plays were staged there. Other examples he refers to are the theatres led by Aurélien Lugné–Poe, which developed symbolism on stage and the creation of poetic reality that were contrary to the court, and a state established theatre company in 1860, Comédie-Française, and many other commercial theatres. They are an example of a model of organization of what nowadays are independent theatres, which sprang up soon after in Berlin, London, and other European cities. These theatres were small-scale, articulating specific aesthetic concepts, critical approach, and an intellectual repertoire. According to Klaić (2012), they profiled the stage director as a new theatre profession in charge of the creative process, which is the central figure in the *standard model* of a theatre.

The independent theatre from the state, as a new model, was developed in different forms and one of the examples is the Moscow Artistic Academic Theatre (MXAT) in 1898, by the dramatic and critic Vladimir Nemirovich – Danchenko and Konstantin Stanislavski, amateur actor and director.

> MXAT shaped a culture of ensemble as harmonious artistic collective, where mutual learning and respect took precedence over any individual sense of stardom or stage narcissism. The composition of the repertoire and its persistent aesthetic were determined by the stage directors, working with regular artistic collaborators and a devoted administrative and technical staff in a long and careful rehearsal process. (Klaić, 2012, p.6)

It can be noticed that this model emphasizes mutuality over the individuality in the creation. However, the accented role of the artistic director is regulating the structure (artistic

collaborators, administration, technical staff, and other), being the central figure in the artistic collective.

Furthermore, this model has been established as an independent model, but it has become a model of all public national theatres, being centrally governed by the state apparatuses.

The role of the public national theatre has changed in the last decades, often by imposed or directed cultural policies to commercialise its programs by different means. Public national theatres are maintaining their structure of organization, not undertaking the position of re-evaluating the impact of such policies. Institutional governing bodies decide to choose strategies of increasing the audiences and ticket sales, so that their income brings the public institution in the position of imitating the commercial theatre. Followed by such strategic decision, communication instruments are oriented towards the populist manner, and programs are somewhere in between the commercial and subsidised shows.

Cultural policy evaluation measures are imposing the indicators of growth of the audience or the ticket sales, where the success of the commercial theatre in such relation undermines the public one, since it brings larger audiences. The populist manner in the cultural policy instruments evaluates success as *growth*, instead of *development*, which influences the distortion of the public theatre's function and enhances the uniformation of the theatre. Public theatres need to justify the use of the subsidies, or to argument the need for public theatres and spaces for performing art. Today, such needs are becoming the main concern of those in the field.

Artistic research and renewal, diversity of artistic expression, critical reflection of the socio-political, economic, and cultural context, affirmation of cultural and social development, educational impact, continuous resource of innovation, and other, are some arguments against the perpetuation of standard procedures, the uniformation of the artistic expression and the

escapist fantasy, which have become a habitual language of the defenders of the public purpose of art.

In Europe, the reliance of the theatre on public subsidies goes back to the Renaissance and the aristocratic patronage, or the Maecenas, and it is embodied in the examples of the Comédie-Française founded by a decree of Louis XIV in 1680, as a merge to the troupe of the Guénégaud Theatre and Hôtel de Bourgogne and Burgtheater in Vienna (1741). These theatres have continued their work through the support and investment by the middle classes and some municipal authorities since the eighteen century, and were reaffirmed by the ideology of nationalism and the national theatre movement of the nineteen century. After World War II, welfare states saw the theatre as a legitimate beneficiary and instrument of democracy, which is contrary to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe where the theatre was seen as a powerful medium of the ideological indoctrination of the masses (Klaić, 2012, p.17).

Such perception is still available in some of the states in Central and Eastern Europe, or there is a reminiscence of it. For instance, in some theatres there is also censorship of certain themes or issues that are not socially accepted, and the theatre still has to adjust, or behave as a mainstream institution through what satisfies the social standard or pleases the masses. An example of this is the whole public lynch of the theatre director Oliver Frljić in Poland, where the dominance of anti-Semitism in the Polish society did not allow his artistic message to come through in the theatre.

Today, public national theatres have problems with subsidies and the cost gap that is unequal, since they have been going through cuts of their subsidies they were getting in the past. Moreover, they are rarely questioning their institutional model and patterns of distribution and production that perpetuate this gap, as Klaić (2012) notes.

The general policies directed towards the liberalisation of the institution from the state subsidies have directed the theatres towards the development of programs intended for the larger audience. In the burst of technology and media, theatres are also becoming a minority option in the leisure time overloaded with entertainment in television, video gaming, film industry, the Internet, and so on, although the new function of the public theatre is being implicitly imposed, and that is to position the theatre on the leisure market prior to its educational and innovation function. The geopolitical situation and crises of 2008 shaped the volume of production and procedures in which art is created. The austerity measures resulted in cuts in the budgets of culture, and mostly in the sphere of independent production. The public institutions' production volume was cut, but nevertheless, the performing arts machinery was supported. National Theatres and Ballet houses could not have four/five premieres on the repertoire. Instead, two large productions and two smaller ones mainly oriented towards modern dance productions or drama theatre plays that are commercially oriented, were produced. Such politics of economy globally, but also its effects on national and local level (in)directly affected the aesthetics, as well as the quality of the repertoire. Such relation between the aesthetics and the economy has emphasized the "leisure function" of the National theatre institutions, since it brought the public theatre closer to the function of the commercial one.

As it was the case before, cultural policies driven by the economic prism are interfering in the programming policies of the institutions. The financial crises did influence the processes, forms, and collaborations, not only through the austerity measures taken by the national states, but also through the new ideologically created political map of foundations, states, and other bodies supporting the creation processes. The crises intensified the political vision of the economic role of culture above its public role. This idea is supported through different legislative and financial instruments, or funding programs that are reinforcing the

commodification of arts into the service. The optimisation of the profit is a priority, but the question of how to optimise the quality of life brought through the created income is also important. The quality of life brings an added value in the process of the profit creation of the "capitalistic machine", creating the illusion that individuals can revitalise themselves, and feel that the income is there to justify that one can live a better life. Therefore, it is important to justify that the institution enabled quality life (understood as leisure time) to more people through art programs, or how many people will see a performance, is becoming a priority and can be measured through quantity indicators which are intensified over the quality indicators, or the growth in culture becomes a priority over development.

The public policies are reshaped in these geopolitical circumstances. Consequently, this also affects the cultural policies as part of the public policies. The issue of creative and cultural industries has become a mode in which culture and art is articulated, aiming to convert it to a sustainable product on the market. Redirecting the ideology of the cultural development has influenced the re-shaping of the financial instruments which have already been reduced, leaving the small, grass root initiatives, small art productions, experimental and developmental processes, micro–level organizations behind, or out of the politically created map.

However, to agree with Klaić (2012), public institutions are failing to reflect the strategies of their work, the models of the institutions and programming, or they are not being aware of institutional change, and here, I think of theatres in particular.

Klaić (2012) discusses few options in their limited effectiveness and inherently defeating outcomes: *Do nothing*, *Hide behind the artistic process*, *Imitate the commercial theatre, and Affiliate the public theatre with a political or a social movement or group* (pp.31- 32) .

Referring to *Do nothing*, he explains that they have been occupied with the repetitive circle of production and distribution, or the model or systematization of the human capacities. They

have not been pro-active and demanding for new systematizations, or programming change, instead blaming on the decision makers as incompetent to secure larger subsidies. They build an "internal culture of complaint and embitterment" that affects the creative process, as Klaić (2012, p.31) observes.

Failing to be pro-active in the involvement with cultural policy making, or in the analyses of the changes of the socio-cultural and economic environment, further brings them to "self-ghettoisation and institutional autism" as Klaić (2012, p.32) notes. He refers to this behaviour as *Hide behind the artistic process*, or they become closed, self-referential and hermetic, therefore being perceived as elitist and failing to communicate changes.

Being pressured to build or increase the audience due to general policy changes, they are approaching towards *Imitating the commercial theatre*, or they are using the most common approach that would increase the box office revenue, which is the commercialisation of the programs, or bringing upwards trivial programming of musicals and comedies. With such an approach, the public theatre loses its function and its public role of being a space for artistic innovation, diversity of artistic expression, critical reflection of the social reality, laboratory for professional development and educational pole for the public. Such approach puts the theatre in a position of compromising the artistic values, or the aesthetic positions which it presents or fosters.

Klaić (2012, p.32) mentions *Affiliation of the public theatre with a political or a social movement or group* as an approach in the national theatres in Europe in the 19th century. Today, such affiliation can also be seen in the post-socialistic countries of Central and Eastern Europe, where theatres or cultural institutions are affiliated with the political party in power, by which the institution is becoming the pole of the party in power (partization of the institution).

In addition to this observation by Klaić (2012), there is *project orientation* of the institutions, which becomes more of a trend rather than a specifically created strategy that will allow institutional change and reformation.

The above mentioned situations are a general observation, which can be seen as limited imagining, or absence of strategic planning, evaluation of the processes, and critical reflection of the institutional work. It also depicts certain institutional fatigue, or escapism from in-depth analyses, produced by the rigidness of the standardized procedures, or constitutional violence, in the words of Bojana Kunst (2017), which on the one hand, supports security, continuity, the effectiveness in the expected outcome, but closes the space for reflection and flexibility.

These examples are confronted by some scholars' argumentations that the issue of security provides consistency that allows movement, dynamics, or possibility for differentiation, in comparison with project logic, for example, and others argue that this was the case of the modernism and institutions today are not protecting the uncertainty.

As mentioned above, Raunig argues that "if the concept of 'institution' implies a desire for long-term duration, continuity, and security, the concept of 'project' by contrast implies limited duration and the negative effects such as precarization and the insecurity associated with it" (Raunig, 2009, xvi).

However, if we change the perspective, we can allow the concept of "project" to address the program developments of the institution and support the logic of continuity and stability. This means that few projects can form a program, or become the line that converges projects into one another, creating a program. On a very pragmatic level, such an institution-project approach can be beneficial for the subsidised environment such as the public institution, where the operational costs, as well as at least half of the program, are secured, thus creating stability. The "projectisation" of the institution does not need to be a pejorative, but it can

have a positive effect instead, opening additional possibilities for experimenting, discovering, and reflecting certain concepts.

The public national or city theatres in South Eastern Europe affiliate the public theatre with a political party in power, as mentioned above, and stimulate the commercial theatre by programming musicals, comedies, or popular texts and dramas. The Macedonian National Theatre has been criticized by the professionals in the field for not employ any recent socio – political or other contemporary problems in their repertoire, meaning that theatres do not provide any critical reflection of the social reality (Toevski, 2015). Maja Stevanovikj, a dramaturge, suggests that performances lack an idea behind them, lack the need to reflect the reality. They are attempts for a "museological reconstruction" of some distant times (Toevski, 2015). She also gives the example of the newly written drama by the Macedonian dramaturge Ognen Georgievski, "Monument", which reflects the issue of monumentalisation that has been recently implemented through the government project "Skopje 2014" (Marusic, 2015)[18], and unfortunately, such a drama cannot be staged, since it has been evaluated as one reflecting the daily political issues. This demonstrates that the theatre is still in use of the establishment as the bastion for production of the nation symbolism.

On the one hand, we have the public model still used as a nation institution in the transitional societies, which also employs the above mentioned strategies, and on the other hand, we have the Western theatres as bastions for the elitist in Klaić's terms. Both need to withdraw from the tactics they are employing in order to revitalise and reform the model of the institution.

Klaić (2012) proposes that topics such as feminism, LGBTI, environmentalism, human rights, solidarity with the unemployed, refugees, battered women, indigenous people – all worthy causes that mobilise the resources of civil society, could profit from some alliance with the theatre, and the theatres could benefit from associations with them. I argue later that not only

[18] Controversial project announced in 2010; materials and study of investigation about the project conducted by The Balkan Investigative Reporting Network, BIRN.

on a content base, but also on the organizational one, this approach can be a possible modelling of a new institutional formation.

Public theatres need to revise their strategies and the possibilities to connect the artistic expression with societal issues and enhance the related and relevant debates. Participation and usership are discussed as methods in museums' revision of the institution, and as principles of deliberative democracy that the theatre can employ in building the social capital and enhancing social cohesion.

Klaić (2012) proposes two general models of theatres which are part of public funding, and these are *the repertoire theatres and the independent theatres*, which bring numerous different variants influenced by their interconnectivity, effects, and transformations.

3.3.2.2 Specific model of a public theatre: Repertoire theatre

A repertory theatre is a model of a Western theatre, opera or a ballet production in which a resident ensemble presents works from a specified repertoire in alternation or rotation.

The model was established by MXAT in 1898, and since then it has been replicated throughout Europe, the USA, Canada, and other, as a model of a theatre company with strong artistic leadership and harmonious ensemble, fixed administrative and technical staff, a building with more stages, spaces for rehearsal, or production facilities, as well as technical and stage equipment, costume, and stage props. This theatre produces a number of premieres in a season, and presents them in the next seasons by rotating or sequential system.

The rotating repertoire becomes a luxury, and it works on scheduling a different production every evening. Thus, a sequential becomes more common, which means that old productions are replaced with new ones after running for a few weeks.

The repertoire theatre is also referred to as repertory theatre or rep, and it is a resident company on a national level, a city or a town. The first known use of the word "repertoire" was in 1847, with its origin from the Latin word "repertorium".[19]

The model aims to sustain a permanent ensemble of actors (dancers, opera singers in the same model of opera and ballet) from different generations and gender, staying for several seasons, or for their entire professional life. They work together to share knowledge and are led by the artistic leader, the specific artistic director who shapes the aesthetics of the repertoire.

Today, many of the artists, or dancers and singers seek other environments and work with diverse colleagues, working conditions, and directors.

Such institutions are oversized, unwieldy, and become production factories incompetent of any change, overwhelmed with the regime, structure of planning, protocols of work and production, which restrict the artistic or creative processes where research or experimenting can be generated. Such institution is synchronizing several different processes simultaneously such as rehearsal of the old productions and their presentation, as well as rehearsals of new productions, costumes, and set making, as well as preparing or planning the next season.

This model was the one replicated in all Central and East Europe countries of the Iron Curtain, as well as in Yugoslavia. Still, many of these public institutions have been working under the same inherited system, protocols, and principles of work. Their program is communicated to the Ministries of cultures, by which it is approved. Sometimes, they are orchestrated by the party in power, which sometimes acts as a “programmer” or a “curator” that commissions a certain program in the repertoire.

Few public institutions have maintained or acquired excellence and reputation. Far more (dance, theatre) companies have slid into commercialisation, while still officially maintaining a non-profit status and public subsidies, and some have used the transition for illegal

[19] http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/repertoire

processes and different private purposes. There are some exceptions that have reformed the repertoire companies. The Archa Theatre in Prague let the entire ensemble of the former Burian Divadlo go in order to become a presenter and a producer – an almost evolutionary move (Klaić, 2012, p.43).

Production houses have appeared as a new model, as well as commercial theatres and autonomous theatre groups.

3.3.3 Collaborative model (new models, heterogenic managing structure, self-instituting)

The collaborative model – or the contemporary cultural institution – (post-)institutional model, (**heterogenic managing structure** - *self-instituting* system - *collaborative- horizontal – models*) as "co-institution" , or as a term where "co" stands for collaborative, commons, coexisting, and so on, is based on participative governing, or sociocracy[20].

3.3.3.1 Models in the alternative theatre scene "collaborative – horizontal – model"

As an alternative to the repertoire and the commercial theatre, a new working environment emerged organized by students, semi or non-professionals, professionals, and later, non-profit organizations, collectives or associations.

[20] It is a relatively new method of governing organizations, whose principles and practices are based on the values of equivalence, effectiveness, and transparency, and are designed to support both the unity and the respect for the individual. In practice, it can be used in all types of organizations, and it is conducted with the attitude that people working together and having relevant organizational knowledge will decide better than the larger voting body of the elected.

Various groups of experimental theatre were established from the end of the nineteenth century, and they were even more proliferated after World War II and later in the 60s and the 70s cultural revolution. These independent theatres have been platforms for innovation, but also labs for artistic development, from which many artists have generated knowledge and later found their vocation in other performing arts models, becoming leaders of companies, venues, and festivals (Klaić 2012 : 44).

According to Marvin Carlson (2009, p.117), the modern concept of the alternative theatre and its beginnings are recorded in Europe somewhere at the end of the nineteen century, when a large number of theatre professionals and theatre amateurs succeeded to form small production houses, initially associations, and then organizations outside of the theatre establishment, with an aim to exit the censorship, to research new ideas and possibilities in dramaturgy, and address new or more specialised audiences.

According to Nada Petkovska (2012), such processes are also in void with the tradition of the drama text, or de-literarisation and re-teatralisation, which was developed by the avant-garde movements in the beginning of the 20th century:

> The main impulse comes from the idea that theatre presents art *sui generis*, which doesn't serve for mediation of drama texts. The reaction of the avant-garde was to bring the language behind and make the human body a theatrical signifier or a signifying system, and to express and present different phenomena, conditions, and processes. (Petkovska, 2012)

These are the views on the basis of which reforms in the theatre were made, marking the transfer from textual towards performative culture departure in few important points: A. Arto and his efforts for a new theatre by the example of the Eastern theatre, J. Grotowski with the idea of the poor theatre in which the actor is dominant, and the standpoints of P. Brook, R. Scheckner and the American avant-garde. And, as Petkovska (2012) notes, according to

Carlson, until 1945, the American theatre is turned towards Europe, and in the sixties it becomes a model and inspiration of the avant-garde modalities of theatre worldwide, as well as in Europe. The term "alternative theatre" is used to determine various theatrical experiments in the sixties.

3.4 The alternative theatre in Macedonia

In his book *Alternative Theatre in Macedonia*, Ljubisa Nikodinovski-Bish (2009), one of the most prominent participants in the processes of the development of the alternative theatre in Macedonia, notes that such processes are beginning with the Kaj Sv. Nikita Goltarot (Goltarite) Theatre, the "Pralipe" Roma Theatre, the Open Theatre University of the Aesthetic Laboratory at the Faculty of Philosophy where the Theatre workshop was established, the festival Youth Open Theatre (MOT), but with other forms as well. According to him, the alternative was always connected with the philosophical and ethical knowledge, as well as with the important aesthetical dimension. The first wave of the alternative theatre in Macedonia begins at the end of the 50s, when the amateur theatre was also established in different cities in the country. Namely, more than 170 groups were registered. Nikodinovski-Bish (2009, p.30) also connects the beginning of the alternative theatre with the opening of the small scene of the Macedonian National theatre.

According to Nikodinovski-Bish (2009), the Kaj Sv. Nikita Goltarot (Goltarite) Theatre is the first group that announced and developed the first alternative concepts based on the *Project of one theatre 70,* established in the beginning of the 70s. Its founders were Vladimir Milchin, Slobodan Unkovski and Martin Panchevski, students at the Academy of Film, Theatre and TV in Belgrade. Their intention was to break through the walls of the institutional theatre and

bring the Macedonian theatre towards contemporary art processes (Nikodinovski-Bish, 2009, p.42).

This group was organized as a theatre – school workshop that implied living and working together in the Monastery St. Nikita in the surrounding of the capital Skopje. The group was using the Grotowski methods and discussing different questions concerning theatre. This group came to an end because of different misunderstandings about their project *Zelenata guska*, as well as public criticism for their last performance *Skici od predanieto Kainavelisko.* The criticism or the attack was coming from the establishment since one of the actors, Nenad Stojanovski, performed a scene naked on the stage in a church premise, which was a stage for the performance within the Ohrid Summer Festival. They were also taken into custody and were accused of liberalism and non-respect of morality, which depicts the socio-political context that they were working in.

This group was formed independently and did not collaborate with one specific institution. They were using the premises of the monastery St. Nikita, where they organized their workshops, rehearsals, discussions, and other, which allowed them to experiment with the theatre language and problems.

Other than this is the Open Theatre University of the Aesthetic Laboratory at the Faculty of Philosophy, where a Theatre workshop was established on the initiative of Ljubisha Nikodinovski-Bish. According to Nikodinovski-Bish (2009), this was an original theatrical, esthetical, and pedagogical idea, which started at the Faculty of Philosophy in 1975 in Skopje. Within the frameworks of the Open Theatre University, in its first year of existence, there were 42 theatre events organized in various spaces such as the Faculty of Philosophy, the Macedonian National Theatre, different workers organizations, primary and high schools, hospitals, and other.

In 1976, The Open Theatre University and the Macedonian National Theatre created a *Self-managing agreement* between them according to regulating their collaboration, and the Open Theatre Institute also became a theatre institute of the MNT.

The alternative in the organization of the communication with the theatre disturbed the path of the institution-creator-scene for the presentation-audience, what the modernists at the beginning of the 20th century were addressing as the darkest aesthetic reality of the "bourgeois theatre", according to Nikodinovski-Bish (2009, p 117).

However, this was a novelty in the collaboration, or the inter-institutional collaboration, which disturbed the institutional theatre logic and brought new methodological approaches in the work and the creation oriented towards emphasizing the idea and the creation against the other standardized elements of theatre presentation such as light, timing, scene formations, and other.

Other cultural formations were established from the Open Theatre University, including the Youth Open Theatre (a festival), the Cultural Summer Festival Skopje (today known as Skopje Summer), the Skopje Jazz Festival, as well as the idea of the formation of the University cultural–informative centre (Nikodinovski-Bish, 2009, p.123).

This initiative of the Open Theatre University brought the idea for the formation of the Theatre workshop (1978 – 1985) within the frameworks of the Faculty of Philosophy, developed by Kiril Temkov, a professor of ethics and aesthetics at the Faculty of Philosophy, Vladimir Milchin, dramaturge and theatre director of the MNT, Ljubisha Nikodimovski–Bish, organizer of the Open Theatre University and collaborator for the MNT, and Kica Bargjioska, an assistant lecturer of aesthetics at the Faculty of Philosophy. The idea of the theatre workshop was oriented towards the Brecht aesthetics and critical approach.

Other alternative forms of organization of the theatre were the *Pralipe Roma Theatre*, established in the beginning of the 70s by Rahim Burhan, with the idea of the radical, poor,

and engaged theatre of Arto, Grotowski, and the Living theatre. This theatre group was also formed to emphasize the societal equality and maturity of the society in relation to the questions of the ethnical minorities.

One of the main influences in the theatrical or performing language of the next generation of creators in theatre or performing arts is the Open Youth Theatre (MOT), a festival formed in 1976, organized by the Open Theatre University and the Youth Centre "25th of May" (Today known as Youth Cultural Centre/ MKC).[21] This festival was a place where the new international theatre and dance performances were presented, especially oriented towards the alternative.

All the above mentioned initiatives, as well as the authors and performers participating in them, made a breakthrough to the Western theatre scenes and vice versa, becoming a benchmark to the new generations of creators.

What we can analyse here is that most of the initiatives, apart from *Goltarite* which had the shortest life, were connected with the institutions, the establishment from where they were acting, forming the initiatives of which some exist as national institutions today.

This atmosphere started to change in the 90s, with one initiative marking the space of non-institutional action and activity, which was the Cultural Centre Mala Stanica, formed by Slobodan Unkovski, theatre director, Gjorgi Simeonov (ex-director of the Youth Centre „25 May"), and actors Nenad Stojanovski and Jovica Mihajlovski.

It was a private or civil initiative to form a new theatre space for young theatre makers. This space enabled young directors, producers, curators to form their first projects. Furthermore, this space was used for exhibitions, music concerts, and other activities. Being a space owned by the state, even though the initiators agreed to use it for ten years, it was taken away and

[21] Its initiators were Kiril Temkov and Ljubisha Nikodimovski-Bish, as representatives of the Open Theatre University, as well as Georgi Simeonov, director of the Youth Centre and Iso Rusi, theatre programmer.

established as the Cultural Centre Mala Stanica, which is run by national institution or one of the spaces of the National Gallery of Macedonia.

Lacking the creativity, the Macedonian establishment so far has not established a strategy to develop this institutional space, and it is one used under its capacities, while vivid independent creators are away from spaces of creation.

However, Mala Stanica was the earliest attempt to make a model of a non-institutional cultural space, based on a public – private partnership which was closed due to lack of political sensitivity towards the needs of the vivid young contemporary art scene at a time when it started to pave its path.

In this space of alternative activities in the 70s, 80s and 90s, dance did not find its actualisation as an art form, neither independently nor through any actions within the institution.

4. (One) perspective on performing arts

Using the different theoretical standpoints found in articles, interviews, projects, discussions, workshops, this part will be focused on formulating standpoints in the field of contemporary dance considering the terms of choreography, dance, and institution. These findings include the analysis of the formats, or the procedures as part of the production processes, the dissemination of the works and its presentation in this part of the performing arts field. Its specificities require new systems of governing, internal negotiations, communications with other social authorities (Hasitschka, Tschmuck and Zembylas, 2005), as well as interpellations in the governing policies.

In the subsequent chapters of this thesis, I will present one model and approach of a contemporary performing art space as a social agent, in the context of Macedonia, based on the use of the postmodern organization theory approach.

I will offer a perspective that is part of this work, or what I mean when I think about performing arts, or contemporary dance, performance, and choreography. As so far developed, this thesis offers approaches, methods, methodologies, but advocates for a specifically related methodology approach that is context driven. Navigating through different perspectives allows the formulation of a certain methodological frame of dance institution formation, specifically in the context of Macedonia, which would be differentiated from the established existing institutions in the field of theatre and ballet. The new institution model should incorporate the new experimental field of dance, critical dance, conceptual dance, or choreography in its wider meaning. Such institution, therefore, should be based on a system that can incorporate open formats of production, creation, and reflection, allowing

participation as production of sociality in contemporary institution, as Bojana Kunst (2015) articulated in her lecture at HZT[22].

Moreover, the general analysis will be used as a comparative method to identify the Macedonian situation in this specific context.

4.1 Dance, choreography, performance as contexts related notions

As a theoretical perspective I propose the performance studies, through which a new standpoint can be offered for merging the spheres of action in the field of art, or a perspective where the borders are arbitrary, and as such, they should be moved and removed, which would enable the creation of a new standpoint for merging these fields of art in a political, as well as an artistic, socio-cultural, and even an economic sense. This is a perspective that will displace the hegemonic position of the theatre or the ballet as an institution, or allow a reformulation of the field, the model, and the mode of action.

The performance studies are a new and specific discipline, a method of investigating the performance. They emerge as a synthesis of a number of disciplines such as sociology, feminist theories, theories of gender, history, psychoanalysis, queer theory, semiotics, ethology, cybernetics, theory of media, theory of popular culture, and other (Schechner, 2002, p.2), which enable analysis, investigation of all the aspects of the human behaviour, from performance in the everyday life to art performance in the visual and performance arts.

[22] Lecture by Bojana Kunst, 3 July 2015, at HZT Uferstudio 8, MA SODA Micro-series "Economies of Performance"; Part of series of lectures given by Bojana Kunst and Sergej Pristas to establish an interpretative frame to discuss questions of performance labour and forms of production, as well as their ongoing transformation.

These studies deal with the act of performance, but also its social, political, cultural consequences and the everyday expansion of these contexts. They view performance as a vital art practice, also considering the review and establishment of means for a better understanding of the social, political, and cultural processes (Jovicevic and Vujanovic, 2006, p. 7).

Schechner (2002, p.2) explains performance as action, or "a "broad spectrum" of human actions ranging from ritual, play, sports, popular entertainments, the performing arts (theatre, dance, music), and everyday life performances", explaining the four ways of interest, practice, and inclusion. These studies are close to the avant-garde, the marginal, the minoritarian, the subversive, and the projects within this field act against strictly determined, formal, hierarchies of ideas, organizations, or people (Schechner, 2002, p.4).

Or, according to Barbara Kirshenblatt – Gimblett, an American theorist of performance and one of the founders of the Department of Performance Studies at the New York University, performance studies:

> starts from the premise that its objects of study are not to be divided up and parcelled out, medium by medium, to various other disciplines – music, dance, dramatic literature, art history. The prevailing division of the arts by medium is arbitrary, as is the creation of fields and departments devoted to each. (Schechner, 2002, p.3)

On the other hand, also within the frameworks of reviewing the cultural institution, I propose the theoretical frame of the **postmodern perspective of the organization theory** that emphasizes the constantly changing relation among the concepts, which are defined only in relation to other concepts. Accordingly, all words, including concepts, are defined in relation to other words and concepts, and not in relation to objects (Hatch and Cunliffe, 2006, p.17). The focus of this perspective in the organization theory is that the organizational texts should be deconstructed, while destabilizing the managerial ideologies and the modernist models of

organizing and theorizing, revealing the marginalized and oppressed views, supporting the reflexive and inclusive forms of theorizing and organizing.

This standpoint offers a theoretical basis for reconsideration of the organizational format of a cultural institution through deconstruction of the management model, which is certainly conditioned by the contents, as well as the political ideological premise upon which it develops. *This perspective, which I offer here as a method* of considering dance, choreography, and performance as performance arts, offers a *deconstruction of the dominant managerial models of institutions in the field* of choreography, dance, and performance, or ballet and theatre, for example. Furthermore, it *offers* an opportunity to review them through a new perspective which is not conditioned in this case by the discipline or the tradition as starting fields of values. Here, it is proposed, and used, *as a methodological approach for the deconstruction of the modernist managerial paradigm* of the cultural institution *trying to amplify the voice* of one marginalized field, through offering new reflexive forms of theorizing and organizing. This perspective is the post-modern managerial paradigm in culture, and is related to what has been suggested in the previous chapters as a post-modern institution, co-institution, heterogenic management, self-organized systems, and moreover, with participative and rhizomatic governance, as well as the institution as a producer of sociality, or socially and politically relevant content.

Also, to talk in relation to the above mentioned and in relation to dance, or to articulate what I think when I talk about dance, I would give the very basic and broad assumption about dance that I developed together with Slavcho Dimitrov through our research on choreographic practices in Macedonia that follows nearly till the end of this chapter:

> ‘Bearing in mind the problems of posing any immanentist or transcendent criteria as means for defining dance beyond any historical horizon and particular and singular socio-historical configurations, we think that it is insufficient to simply state, in a

negative theological manner, what dance is not, henceforth some positive construction is needed in order to delineate the field of dance (Randy, 1998, p.7). We approach dance as "embodied social practice," henceforth a process in time and space that performs, that is to say brings into being, enacts, articulates and materializes meanings and relations between bodies, objects and the world by the means of lived corporeal physicality as being always "embedded in specific material and ideological conditions of possibility (Desmond, 2001, p.13). Therefrom, we are aware of the different assumptions, beliefs, and ideologies about the body that different dance practices have employed and enacted, such as, to name a few: Duncan's body as the medium for divine expression of the human spirit; the modernist attempts to extract and enact on stage the essential features of human emotion and the metaphysics and universals of human experience; Graham's insistence that movement never lies; Wigman's approach to dance choreography as a confession and unmasking of the human psyche; Debora Hay's body as the fluid aggregate of cells and the enactment of the world as a motion; Balanchine's body as a display of geometry, design, proportion, and ideal forms (See Foster, 1986); Cunnighman's matter-of-factness of the body as jointedness of bones, muscles, ligaments, and nerves, and the pedestrian, de-skilled everyday body (See Copeland, 1983); or Rainer's concrete, intelligent, neutral, and minimal body with its actual weight, mass, and unenhanced physicality (See Banes, 1980; Archias, 2016); Childs and Brown's accumulation techniques that bring forth the bodily meanings exceeding the explicitly visible content of the repeated materials (See Ramsay, 2006); Bausch's body as the locus of social norms' performativity, or Le Roy's body without organs[23].

[23] Or, as Lepecki (2006, p.5) argues "If choreography emerges in early modernity to remachine the body so it can "represent itself" as a total "being-toward-movement," perhaps the recent exhaustion of the notion of dance

Considering all these historical variations, our main starting point, on the one hand, sets dance as a practice that brings attention to the body as the main epistemological, ontological, and social mechanisms by which the world is made manifest, known, experienced, and existent (See George-Graves, 2015; Brandstetter and Klein, 2013). On the other hand, and subsequent to the first claim, we treat dance as a "reflexive mobilization of the body […] a social process that foregrounds the very means through which bodies gather" (Randy, 1998, p.7), and are being mobilized; hence, a corporeal practice that by its own reflexivity either reproduces or ruptures the habituated bodily forms of being and understanding the world, and opens lines of flight for different becomings and transformations of movement, gesture, effect, perception, sensation, awareness, and embodied knowledge[24]. In trying to keep the ontological grounds of dance open beyond any metaphysical claim, we set dance as a gesture that has neither end in itself, nor is a movement as means for some predestined goal, dance as "nothing more than the endurance and the exhibition of the media character of corporal movements," the "communication of communicability" (Agamben, 2000, p.58). In a similar manner, we can further say, quoting Trisha Brown, that: the body doesn't move with the clarity of line or mechanics…Dancing is like scribbling, you know, because of the inconsistencies of human anatomy…It's the human failure factor in the

---

as a pure display of uninterrupted movement participates of a general critique of this mode of disciplining subjectivity, of constitute being".

[24] This position would also take into consideration Lepecki's critique of the dances' and Modernity's ontology of movement and motility. As Lepecki (2006, p.124) argues "choreography comes into being as a technology particularly able to answer and foster modernity's melancholic project […] This perception suggests for critical dance studies that Western theatrical dance – as it confined itself in increasingly more abstracted rooms (the court, the salon, the theatre, the studio) in its drive toward artistic autonomy – must be theoretically approached not just as a kinetic project but as an affective one. An affective project profoundly marked by the infusion of the kinetic at the core of subjectivity generating continuous complaints of dance always going away, irremediably bound to its own loss, of never quite being there at the fleeting moment when it visibly moves".

exposition of form that makes for this marvelous thing called dance, which is highly imperfect from the beginning. (Ramsay, 2006, p.146)

It is precisely through these assumptions and minimal definitions of dance, as an embodied social practice exploring what makes a body do what it does, what a body can do, and how bodies' doing does the world, that we set to map an archeology of dance and contemporary choreographic practices "piercing through" other art disciplines and practices (See Pristaš, Hrvatin and Kunst, 2007)[25], all of which share and can be enveloped through their performative elements and characteristics (See Fischer-Lichte, 2008; Fischer-Lichte, 2014; Schechner, 2003). Considering, for example, the simultaneous developments, shared aesthetic interests and cultural and historical influences of the contemporary physical theatre and the techniques of the post-modern, the Judson and post-Judson dance, we tried to map some histories and practices of choreographing the body in the physical and alternative theatre in Macedonia in the early 70s. Both forms function based on the premise that the body "has the ability to generate meaning, not only interpret it or act as a symbol for something else," and starting from this premise, setting the body's presence as the only requirement for creative authority, forging "performers-as-creators" (Murphy, 2015). Centered on the moving and speaking body, the physical theatre confronted the hegemony of theatre defined by its literary and verbal dimensions (See Murray and Keefe, 2007), and raised the body to the central stage, or at least at the equally important footing as the literary text (See Shepherd, 2006)[26]. In the physical theatre's distinctiveness, rooted in the performer's body as the starting body, "the body

[25] The phrase is taken from a statement of East Dance Academy; see Goran Sergej Pristaš, Emil Hrvatin, Bojana Kunst, "East Dance Academy", *Maska*, No 103/104, Ljubljana, 2007.

[26] One can make this claim for theatre in general as well, and solely for the physical theatre in its historical specificity. See Shepherd Simon, *Theatre, Body, and Pleasure*, London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

> becomes the center of attention, not as a carrier of meaning but in its physicality and gesticulation. The central theatrical sign, the actor's body, refuses to serve signification" (Lehmann, 2006, p.95).' (Dimitrov and Tanurovska-Kjulavkovsi, 2017).

Or, to sum up, when I talk about an institution of performing arts here, I think about contemporary choreographic and dance practices, a performing body movement related practices, set in relation to other art and "body movement practices", or about performing arts practices, dance, performance, choreography considering that their "main importance is thinking of the body through two vectors: as an artistic material or tool (i.e., body as object or medium of art) and, what is even more important, the body of the very artist or the artist's body (i.e. body as subject of art)" (Vujanović, 2009).

Here, I think more about the second vector, or the artist's body, or the body as subject of art.

4.2 Dance spectrum – basic differences and specificities

In the performing arts and the performance arts spectrum, dance remains the most vulnerable and marginalized. However, the broad varieties of dance are not in the same position and their conditions of work differentiate from one another. The classical ballet enjoys the sustainable one, since it is nurtured and supported through different public subsidies. Classical Ballet ensembles include core de ballet, or the ballet ensemble, as well as soloist and principle dancers. They are very hierarchical, based on mechanisms of pressure to be fit, formally appropriate to the standards of the classical ballet dancer's body, therefore having a rigid daily routine of exercise. The system of production is based on repetition of the technical formations and choreographies from the 19th century, which can be re-adapted, yet formatted in a narrow range repertoire. This is a hierarchical and standardized production process that is

not open to innovation. Even though some ensembles collaborate with contemporary choreographers, still, the formalized rhetoric, style, routine, standardized technique, and hierarchy driven formations are (re)produced, as well as the aesthetics of the formal beauty and fantasized vertical bodies. Audiences are the professionals from the field, those who have attended ballet classes, as well as the conventional audience in general, or the audience that is "willing to re-immerse itself in the repetition of well–known subject matter, themes and sequences from the classical works" (Klaić, 2012, p.69).

Modern dance emerged as a new approach in dance that contradicted the rigid, formalised technique and movement, the "iron" and narrow repertoire, the hierarchical production process and formalization. Early modern dance incorporated popular dances, expressionism, exoticism, and emancipation of the body through different technique approaches.

> European expressionism resulted in an unusual, dramatic, and paradoxical transformation of the European universal concepts of human expression (as the alienation of the internal state) with the American pragmatism (concretism and effectivism in human work) and behaviourism (expression as demonstration behaviour and not as opening of transcendental or psychological *interiors*). It has influenced the modernistic culture and dance art. While the expressionism of Laban and Wigman was demonstrating inner emotions through body expression, the new or modernistic American dance occurred not in search of the inner source, but the behavioural universal and above-or-trans cultural modus of construction of the gesture, movement, appearance, and body behaviour which are suggesting of the bodies in the archaic rituals. (Cvejić et al., 2002, p.11)[27]

In America, as a result of the experiments in the neo-avant-garde, the radicalisation of the modern dance, and the turnover in anti-technique and anti-dance, in the late 50s and 60s, the

[27] Translated by the author from Serbian.

minimal dance appeared. At the time, there were socio-political and cultural changes in America that influenced the turnover. One of them was sexual emancipation that influenced different perspectives on the body. Critics of modernism at the time were at their peak, in other art fields as well, and minimal dance began in parallel with the critique of modernism.

> Minimal dance is characterized by the relationship of the choreographic and dance (i.e, choreographic-dancing as performing) conceptualization of the body, body movement, the relationship of the body and objects in the real (non-fictional) time and space and with space. Minimal dance releases dance art from technique, allocating and elaborating body movements and models of typical non-typical behaviour in relation to the phenomenon of dance, dance concept and tradition of modernist dance. Dance involves gestures and movements, i.e., conditions and processes of the body that are not dancing, but belong to various forms of behaviours. In this way, the artist in the dance is not only a disciplinary determined dancer, but is a Performer, who does not necessarily have to come from the dance education. In this sense, minimal dance comes as turnover from the art of dance in the artistic practice of performing conceptualized physical conditions and processes, and that means in some kind of performance art (performance art). (Cvejić et al., 2002, pp.13-14)

In that, another term appears as not very consistent, and this term is postmodernism. Postmodernism in dance is related to different tendencies in the USA and Europe. In USA, in the 60s and the 70s, as the term is in relation to the evolution of minimal dance, or post-minimal dance, experimental, performance art, evolution of the relation between dance and theatre through “performing”, while in Europe, the term is in relation to different directions connected to the ideas of reconstruction or simulation of fiction in relation to the avant-garde, new or experimental dance (Cvejić et al., 2002, pp.14-15).

In the interview[28] with Rok Vevar from 2016, he points out that contemporary dance from the beginning of the 20th century is a specific aesthetical kind of "unsuccessful permanent revolution", in Trotsky's terms, that self-recognizes itself as (political and aesthetical) avant-garde that tries to direct different strata of society in movement. It is nowhere localized or nationalized, but, on the other hand, it is successfully internationalized. Contemporary dance exists internationally and has no location, and it is always more successful outside the borders of its own country of origin. He also connects the contemporary dance with the modern economic transitions which possess the surplus of the non-functional properties (the USA in the phase of the great economic depression, or the transition to neoliberalism that is born on the erosion of the industrial production, and Great Britain in the same phase) or modern nationalistic political movements (Germany in the 20s and the 30s, the USA in the phase of the political imperialism in the 30s until the end of the Cold War), and/or the Flemish national emancipation (the 60s and the 70s), as well as the inflation of the rhetoric and devaluation of language in the phase of political turns (the collapse of the socialistic systems and their communistic practices in the 80s, and the implosion of compromising nationalistic drama theatres that are suddenly interesting in the stage movements).

The end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century brought something new to the "dance world", and this is critical research, deconstruction, and simulation of the institution of dance/ballet in the Western art, which has been referred to as conceptual dance.

Related to the European choreographers such as Jérôme Bel, Boris Charmatz, Xavier Le Roy, Thomas Lehmen, Tom Plischke, Tino Sehgal, conceptual dance:

> has decisively moved from the interest for immanent questions of the dance to the "external" or "political" questions of dance as an art institution, and the problematisation of dance as an institution and the dance technique as a modus of

[28] Interview with Rok Vevar, dance theoretician, dance activist from Ljubljana, Slovenia.

instrumentalisation of the power and the identity of the dance institution. (Cvejić et al., 2002, pp.18-19)

Conceptual dance has created new experiments in the field, which have moved dance out of its ontological relation with movement. It has reshaped the dance field by its relation to other fields, as well as to theory such as cultural studies and post-structuralism, which have brought thinking that has enabled reformation of the field of dance and choreography, and consequently, the procedures and circumstances of work, creation, production, and distribution.

The ex-Yugoslavian context at the beginning of the 20th century was barely related to the Western dance developments, and very much under the influence of the ballet, which influenced its late 20th and 21st centuries dance scenes' functioning. Ana Vujanović (2007) explains the situation in Serbia in the 90s stating that the social role of dance supposed to be enacted at the level of its politically engaged content (which was rendered by theatrical elements, often taken from the 60s), and not at the level of critical re-thinking of *dispositif* of the institution of dance or of its historical heritage of ballet and mainstream modern dance (which was the case of the West). This can also clarify why contemporary European dance paradigms - led by Jérôme Bel, Xavier Le Roy, and other conceptual choreographers – focused on performance self- reflection, did not influence local actors of the performing arts until the last couple of years (Vujanović, 2007).

Conceptual dance influenced the redefinition of dance as an art form in the post-2000s, as mentioned above, and opened even more questions on how to read dance, how to critically reflect dance, and also how to develop the facilities in which a new dance paradigm is created. Being away from all previously determined production processes, or organization of the art form, conceptual dance formed another relation to the social authorities, to the audiences, demanding self-reflection processes, different formats of production, creation, and

distribution of the art form. The notion of dance and choreography has been reformed and viewed through their relation to and impact on other body(ies), or through it (other bodies) to the politics, culture, aesthetics, space and time, language. Another paradigm is the social choreography, or what kind of dance is possible in specific contexts or ideological circumstances.

The question of what is (contemporary) dance, is in some way a phenomenological question, and at the same time, a question that was asked by the modern and postmodern American dance (the esthetical dance paradigm that had the need to build an identity and to define it through clearly defined border and formulation of its importance and, at the same time, its negativity), and also a question of cultural history in which contemporary dance is always in relation with dominant cultures and praxes such as ballet - in a way, it is a class struggle, as Rok Vevar (2016) points out.

What kind of dance is possible in certain ideologically or politically and economically framed context is probably one of the most relevant questions which affect the constitution of dance as institution or as a socially relevant art sphere. Also, it affects the use of the term and its relations. Being part of the discussion as part of many events, among which the event Advocates of Dance[29], I faced the disparate comprehension of dance, or more precisely, the use of the word dance in different cultural contexts. The post-communist or post-social contexts of Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, ex-Yugoslavia, and other countries, try to affirm a new meaning of dance which was dominantly related to politically created identities through folklore dances, as well as new pop dance forms which evolved in the period of the transition. Furthermore, dance was related to white ballet as an institutional form of dance. Dance, as a contemporary form, or as a practice distinguished from the folk, pop dance, or ballet is still

[29] *Advocates of Dance* is the second advocacy activity of Nomad Dance Academy, organized as part of Nomad Dance Institute action/ Performing Situation Room within the frame of the Life Long Burning Project, more: http://nomaddanceinstitute.tumblr.com/

not widely recognized. Therefore, it is used in the contemporary dance scene with additional explanations, or words. Festivals, or events connected with contemporary dance are using "contemporary dance" more often accompanied with "performance" as an additional explanation that would indicate other forms of expression that can be found in the field, but cannot be related to dance as perceived in the traditional use of the term. This is also why this chapter uses the term performance next to choreography and dance, but also, this is not the only thing that is to be articulated here.

On the other hand, in the Western European context, the heritage of dance is diverse. Therefore, it is related to many aesthetical, as well as organizational forms of dance as institution.

In the USA, it is used in a different manner, or as Mariana Valencia (2017), a choreographer and performer with whom we collaborated on several occasions, explains after her visit and participation in the event Nomad Dance Advocates in Belgrade:

> I'm moved by the amount of time that language is given here – an element that's as important as the art itself – and it's beautiful to be in the company of others who think the same. The term "Contemporary Dance" in the Balkans stands as the definition of what New York artists now call, experimental dance or perhaps to some extent, do it yourself (DIY) dance. Historically, experimental dance has endured as a marginalized art form because it's an economically un-capitalist practice that's based on the labor and energy of the body unlike any other form. I must interject here to examine that I'm only speaking to the marginalization of experimental dance forms in this report and that I deeply recognize that traditional, indigenous and vernacular dance forms suffer even greater disparities because of oppressive White oppression, control and legitimization. In all forms of dance the body is our medium, brain and life; the body holds memory and is the best archive of our work. From an audience's standpoint,

> their bodies sit or stand in space to experience a performance; hence dance cannot exist without the commodification or utility of *any* body and therefore, the body also needs space. Dance cannot be preserved, recorded or bought as an authentic object of itself because dance is free of being a product and for these and other valuable reasons, dance is a threat to people who chose to confine it to any economy.
>
> Politically, there is risk that needs to be taken in order to give dance forms the proper place within an economic value system. It's a risk that must be taken within the realms of research-based and experimental forms (as well as traditional, indigenous and vernacular dance forms); a risk that upholds the potential of outcome and exchange – not the monetary value of product. Policy and risk go hand in hand in this topic, especially in Serbia where the government has chosen to devalue the contribution dance can give to cultural identity, enrichment and the healthy, balanced development of a society. "Make room for dance!" they say. (Valencia, 2017)

In the Western European context, dance was ontologically related to movement, as in Eastern Europe, which also led to the inability to refer to new dance experiments as relevant, or to situate dance in other philosophical and theoretical frames.

As one of the relevant examples of this, which Lepecki (2006) gives in the introduction of his book *Exhausting Dance Performance and politics of movement*, is the most obscure civil case in the Court of Dublin in 2004 that was brought against the International Dance Festival of Ireland being accused of display of nudity and alleged performance of lewd acts in a dance piece titled *Jérôme Bel* (1995) by the contemporary French choreographer Jérôme Bel. It was dismissed by supported claims that this piece was not dance, or claims that *Jérôme Bel* could not be properly classified as a dance performance. On 8 July 2004, according to the Irish Times: "There was nothing in the performance [he] would describe as dance, which he

defined as ‘people moving rhythmically, jumping up and down, usually to music but not always’ and conveying some emotion. He was refused a refund” (Lepecki, 2006, p.2).

Lepecki (2006) argues that such an example, as well as others that he brings forward show that the choreography of the last decade was dismantling the ontological association of dance, which is movement, but such examples also show the inability to critically observe and account new choreographic practices as new dance experiments. Such examples, of which there are many in other contexts as well, depict the inability of the word of critics, or moreover, critical thinking, to be equipped with the new tools of writing and thinking about new choreographic practices. And, I would add that this affects the entire system in which dance is situated, as well as the social formats in which it is institutionalised. Institutions of dance formed as part of the ex-Yugoslavian context also depict the inability to understand new forms of dance and choreography. Institutions valorising dance are settled into the ontological and modern understanding of dance as movement, or body of representation. Such standpoint represents the ideological formation in which dance and the body are situated and disciplined in the frame from where they can be controlled and represented.

> If choreography emerges in early modernity to remachine the body so it can “represent itself” as a total “being-toward-movement,” perhaps the recent exhaustion of the notion of dance as a pure display of uninterrupted movement participates of a general critique of this mode of disciplining subjectivity, of constitute being. (Lepecki, 2006, p.7)

Situated in such an ideological system, the art form is looking for its tactics to dismantle such dictation, trying to effectuate its new experiments through diverse organizational formats creating an environment where they can be articulated. Such an environment in ex-Yugoslavia is the independent cultural scene, where the new dance world is produced.

The world of dance has changed, therefore, so has the meaning of the terms such as dance and choreography.

Ana Vujanović (2015) gives a theoretical explication related to the changes of the meaning of the notion of art that is conditioned by its surrounding, or explaining that with the introduction of the term "the artworld", as part of the institutional theory, the answer was given. "At bottom it implies that 'to see something as art requires something the eye cannot decry – an atmosphere of artistic theory, a knowledge of the history of art: an artworld', as Arthur Danto explained in his article 'The artworld' (Danto, 1964, p.580)" (Vujanović, 2015, p.30).

She explains that this shows that:

> although there is no fundamental perceptible difference between Taylor's and Bel's stillnesses, the atmosphere of dance theory, the knowledge of the history of dance: danceworld, was not capable of recognizing Taylor's gesture as dance and it disappeared into the ocean of neo-avant- garde experiments of the late 1950s and 1960s. (Vujanović, 2015, p.30)

The context has changed in the 1990s, therefore, the "conceptual cloud" artworld elaborated by many institutional theorists of art, most prominently George Dickie, has also changed. Vujanović (2015) proposes institutional theory as a tool to reflect on the arts, and see how art as a social institution operates in practice, explaining that:

> the artworld is what defines art and makes it possible, and it itself functions as an institution, from which follows that art has a social property and is thus an institution from the start and not an extra institutional practice to be later institutionalized or to escape institutionalization. Although it is possible to imagine some hypothetical examples of art that take place outside society. (Vujanović, 2015, p.31)

The dance world has changed, and so have the notions of dance, choreography within it. In the interview in Critical Correspondence about the Dance and the Museum, Marten

Spangberg (2014) talks about the dance and choreography not as inter-dependent, but incompatible, and different, not casual to each other, arguing that "choreography is not necessarily the making of dance, nor is all dance made through choreography".

He describes choreography and dance as follows:

> *Choreography is matter of organization, of ordering and making stable,* although stability is many things. Choreography's first enterprise is to domesticate movement. *Choreography is concerned with structures and structuring*, and obviously every structure needs expression. One of these expressions is dance but it is not the only expression that choreography can take on. *Dance on the other hand is strategic*, it is not about ordering but instead of *maneuvering, of navigating through structures, through order*. Dance is an expression into the world, dance is certainly organized but the organization is not the dance, it is the organization and the principles need not be choreography although they can be read through choreography. To choreograph needs have nothing to do with dance, and it goes without saying that one need not have any dance skills to choreograph [those who say so are just dance teachers afraid of losing their jobs]. Similarly, dancing is always organized but one need have no idea about choreography to make them. Recently the term choreography as expanded practice has been used to emphasize how organization is non-linear to expression, choreography to dance and that *choreography needs to be considered a cluster of tools that can be used both to produce and analyze autonomous to expression, i.e. choreography has become a generic set of tools, a technology or a field of knowledge*. [30] (Spangberg, 2014)

There are some other examples that make us understand that choreography has extended its meaning to many diverse context related readings. In the Corpus[31] online magazine, we can see the survey that was dealing with the Terms, Notions, their use and changes in the field of

[30] Underlines by the author.

[31] http://www.corpusweb.net

dance. The starting point was to investigate the significant changes through which dance underwent in the past decade or the past fifteen years, and how such changes influenced the changes of the term. As explained by Corpus (2016), they work on the investigation and discursive illumination of dance as contemporary dynamics, which has provoked and incited the editors to closely examine the position of choreography due to its indivisible nature in relation to dance.

Therefore, they invited more than 100 people from the performing arts to answer the question "What does ‘choreography' mean today?” as concisely as possible.

Forty nine texts were published in English and German. In their opinion, this project “makes a fantastic polylogue, a many-voiced deliberating, de- and circumscribing, which in reading presents exactly what dance and choreography are today: a volume of possibilities bordering on the ecstatic, in which dance today shows itself” (Corpus, 2016).

However, these are some of the voices, or some of the perspectives that we can have, none of these are wrong or right, but diverse, proposing the stands, or understandings on what choreography and dance can be today.

4.3 Dance, choreography and performance as notions and fields in Macedonia

The development of the contemporary dance in the last decade and a half in Macedonia, was highly influenced by the developments in the ex-Yugoslavian countries. The circumstances in which contemporary dance has developed in ex-Yugoslavia are very different from one to another context. In this thesis, some examples will be given as case studies where certain aspects concerning the scenes development will be articulated. Mostly, the issue of space, or an institution, will be overviewed through case studies of conferences and meetings where

these issues were communicated by the professionals from the respective scenes, as well as other European examples.

In the last period, from 2010, or even before 2010 in Slovenia and Croatia, dance did re-shape its position, critically reflecting the dance institution, production processes, political influences, the market, and other, being a screen to socio-cultural and political (non)conditions in which dance or performing art and contemporary culture is produced, which become a constitutive part of the performing arts works.

In most of the countries in the region, the contemporary dance is yet developing as part of the independent art scene, however, there were several institutions established (for example, Španski Borci in Ljubljana, and Zagreb Dance Centre[32]) as new forms of models. Furthermore, new models were also developed on the map of Europe. Some of the many include Tanzquartier in Vienna, Austria, Workspaces for performance art[33] and Caravan Production[34] (in Belgium), Uferstudios in Berlin, and other as new spaces, formats of functioning and enhancing, or endeavouring the dance development.

Such formations are in some cases (Workspaces in Belgium) directly connected to the policy matters – such as Canaries in the Cole Mine, Master plan for dance in Flanders and Brusseles, Tanzplan Deutzland, and other.

To depict what constitutes the contemporary performing arts in Macedonia, or to position them, we need to compare them to the classical, traditional, or mainstream performing arts

[32] http://www.plesnicentar.info/en/about-us The position of this centre changed in 2016. Due to political decisions and without consulting the dance scene professionals, it was delegated to ZKM (Zagrebacko Kazaliste Mladih/Zagreb Youth Theatre) and the autonomy was taken. Until November 2016, The Croatian Institute for Movement and Dance (HIPP) ran the space. Dance professionals have organized themselves and protested against this decision asking for autonomy to dance (some information in Croatian https://www.tportal.hr/kultura/clanak/dosta-je-samovolje-prije-izbora-zelimo-samostalnu-ustanovu-za-ples).

[33] Workspace Brussels as one of them.

[34] https://www.caravanproduction.be

scene. Mainstream institutions are characterised by a hermetic approach. This means that they are closed to new tendencies, theories, and to deliberation of the art system. Their protocols of governing and producing are obsolete; the budgets for their performances are large or even huge (compared to the rest of the sector); they also represent vast machinery which supports their production apparatus.

Contemporary theatre and contemporary dance is the opposite of all this. The contemporary scene is characterised by small and adaptable productions, scene, and costume design. It is related to critical deliberation and orientation towards contemporary cultural theory that offers tools for critical reflection on the models of institutions and modes of production. Production conditions are adaptable, and so are the mechanisms of support. It is not always oriented towards product as performance only, but instead a focus on the working processes, knowledge production, and transfer of knowledge, as well as new production approaches and principles in the creation process. Research and new models of collaboration are also among the characteristics of contemporary performing arts. The above is aimed to distinguish what represents the independent contemporary performing arts, and is done with respect to the practices of the mainstream approach described (Bogavac, 2008)[35]. However, the mentioned adaptability and flexibility control the precarious working conditions that are unfortunately the most evident in this field in the countries in ex-Yugoslavia, followed by professional dissatisfaction, burnouts, dissolution of some of the scene(s), or in some cases, de-professionalization (changing professions due to existential reasons), and breakdown of many relations, or collaborations. Adaptability and flexibility have to be supported financially as methods of work that allow experimentation, or research towards production of knowledge,

35 See also Milena Bogavac text in *Raster 1*, an annual journal of contemporary performing arts, in the edition *Teorija koja hoda (Walking Theory)*, and her distinction between mainstream and alternative, or contemporary performing arts in Serbia, p. 13-20. I am referring to Bogavac here since she discusses the theatre scene and its problems in Serbia in a more elaborated way, depicting the relation between mainstream, contemporary or alternative in Serbia, which I find very similar to the Macedonian context.

approaches, and other. Such practices have to be institutionally supported in their heterogeneity.

The genesis of the Macedonian dance scene can be classified in three chapters according to Sonja Zdravkova-Dzeparoska, directly related to the changes in the socio-political context and its implications in the field of art (Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski and Zdravkova-Dzeparoska, 2014). Zdravkova-Dzeparoska is relating the first private dance studio in Skopje to Sofija Miholić Cvjetičanin, who was one of the distinguished students of Maga Magazinovic, at the time of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (Her name is found in the list of pupils and performers in the studio Magazinovic, as well as in the photo archive of the activity of the studio Magazinovic). This implies a relation to the practice of Émile Jaques-Dalcroze. Sofija Miholić Cvjetičanin came to Skopje by circumstances, and accordingly, Zdravkova-Dzeparoska started with education and transfer of the latest current practices in this period in Europe with a system completely opposed to classical ballet. The activities of the studio were followed by a series of performances and stage presentations (Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski and Zdravkova-Dzeparoska, 2014).

The political developments, the Second World War, and the establishment of new social and political order led to the establishment of completely new aesthetic values and codes that actually, basically, rely on the experiences and the norms of the countries of the Eastern bloc, dominated by the USSR. In this period, Macedonia was going through a “cultural revolution”, or an establishment of the basis of the system, as well as a cultural system, such as the establishment and creation of a range of cultural institutions: theatres (the first time that the audience has the opportunity to see opera and ballet performed by Macedonian artists), museums, the Philharmonic, the first professional ensemble of folk dances and songs "Tanec", and other, which carry the attribute Macedonian. In addition, a network of amateur organizations was formed in order to articulate profile taste and the activities of other layers

of society. Dance education was set on the basis of the classical ballet, and other forms such as modern dance, are not represented in the educational or cultural system of knowledge. Thus, the established institutional forms in the period between 1945 and1991 continue to work in such framework.

The situation, again dictated by the political circumstances, changed in 1991 with the need for a transition from one-party to a multiparty system, i.e. the process of democratization conditioned by exchange with the "West" goods, values, and paradigms. In such process, the links with West Europe were slowly being strengthened, and consequently, exchange of experiences took place. The process of "self-colonization", in Aleksandar Kjosev's terms, was present, where Macedonia transported everything coming from the West with no critical reference to the content and values. However, still being under the visa regime, there were not vast opportunities for exporting, but more for importing the consultants, workshop leaders, teachers, and all other varieties of experts in different fields. Not many had the opportunities to travel and come back with new knowledge which was accepted at the time as valuable. Small raptures were enabling information flow, still not being open and transparent to the larger community. In these raptures, information about modern dance, or the modernisation of dance techniques have been accepted, however, never considered as an art form which brings different perspectives towards dance and the body, but being used for satisfying the audience's needs directed towards the Western modernization of all aspects. The lack of knowledge and understanding of the paradigm in which modern dance has been developed produced a distorted notion of modern dance which was understood as modernisation of the ballet, or stylisation of the ballet, the vertical bodies and techniques. It is a mannerism of the modern dance, without profound understanding of the paradigm. Such mannerism was produced as there was no direct exchange with professionals, but produced second-hand knowledge and information.

> The new conditions imposed simply a simulation or an attempt to "modernize" the repertoire without the "import" of staff that would eloquently perform this operation. From ballet to neoclassical ballet, and then to something that is recognizable as a specific technique of modern dance. At this level the existing state subsidized institutions' early attempts to join the parallel performing practices and poetics, but also internal somewhat justified resistance to abandoning the established models, courses of action and strategic objectives. (Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski and Zdravkova-Dzeparoska, 2014)[36]

This initial "democratisation of the repertory" of the National Ballet was an ad-hock attempt to include something outside the "iron repertoire" performances and the institutional dance scene in Macedonia, as embodied by the Macedonian Opera and Ballet, which continued to operate in a closed frame, oriented largely towards its own choreographic personnel (even though the dancers in the ensemble have been educated in West and East-European centres), a standardised creative process focused on the final product, regional cooperation with professionals from institutions of the former Yugoslavia, and predominantly classical ballet repertories. This is a legitimate institutional policy, but not a stimulating policy for developing an institutional framework to support new dance languages.

Due to this institutional policy, but also the need to innovate in the early 2000s, pioneering steps were taken in the formation of the independent contemporary dance scene. The Performing Arts Centre Multimedia was initiated in 1998, and established in 2000. It organized several workshops with choreographers from Western Europe and the USA. Young dancers connected with the National Ballet, or being educated in the ballet high school,

[36] More details on this issue in: Sonja Zdravkova-Dzeparoska, 2005. *Multimedia Dance Genres* and *Formation and Develoment of the Contemporary Dance Theatre* G. Stardelov, J. Luzhina, I. Dzeparoski (editorial board) in *Theatre on the Macedonian Soil XX* century: 335-375. Skopje: MANU.

participated in the workshops, being directly informed about the new choreographic or teaching approaches in modern and contemporary dance.

Also, a dancer and choreographer, Risima Risimkin, educated as ballet master from the University of Plovdiv, Bulgaria, initiated the Interart Centre for Culture (1996) and developed the dance festival Dance Fest Skopje. She was trained as a classical ballet dancer, and has been employed at the National Ballet for some years. She withdraws from the institution and forms the organization, starting to work as an educator, choreographer, and artistic director of the festival. In 2012/2013, she was working as Head choreographer of the State Ballet of Antalya, Turkey. In 2012 she signed a contract with the Macedonian Ministry of culture, which supported her project "Skopje Dance Theatre" for three years (2013 – 2015) as entrepreneurship in culture. Such a contract was an exception in the history of the cultural development in the independent Macedonia. She was a professor at the University of ESRA Paris-Skopje-New York in Skopje (a private academy), and is now a professor at the University Goce Delcev in Macedonia and an artistic director of the Skopje Dance Academy, program established in collaboration with the Rotterdam Dance Academy from the Netherlands. Through this program, different dancers were educated and are performing at the Skopje Dance Theatre repertoire. Such a format of organization is more related to entrepreneurship in culture and commercialisation of dance, and not to the socio-cultural development or non-profit activities related to the independent art and cultural sector.

Later, Lokomotiva – Centre for New Initiatives in Arts and Culture was established in 2003, and started working on the professional development of the contemporary dance scene in Macedonia. Iskra Sukarova, one of the co-founders of Lokomotiva, had a different educational background than Risimkin. Also, her collaborators come from the field of cultural policy and management, as well as history of art, or art academy of visual arts. Therefore, the organizational processes and content directions were oriented towards experimenting and

researching within the larger field of performance art, and the field of choreography and dance. Sukarova started her education in the field of contemporary dance at the Conservatoire national de région de musique and the Conservatoire national supérieur de musique et de danse in Lyon. She used her experiences from France in a number of productions that she made for the Macedonian Ballet, where she explored the possibilities of relating her choreographic vocabulary and thought to the body of classical ballet, with a systematic, stylized, and synchronized movement conforming to her artistic concepts. In these group works, she tried to introduce the new contemporary kinaesthetic movement into the classical technical vocabulary. At the time, she also tried to implement her physical training and knowledge of contemporary techniques, which, according to her, signified the freedom, flexibility, and open space that she wanted to bring into the institutional context, harmonizing it with the body of conventional ballet. During this phase, she made certain compromises between what she wanted to accomplish as a choreographer and what was at her disposal, which informed her choreographic approach in such predetermined institutional context. However, she was learning in the process, which was the learning by doing method as the only available method to her at the moment. At the same time, during the 1990s and the early 2000s, she continued with her education and received several grants and residencies in Europe and the US. She participated in the P.A.R.T.S. workshops in Brussels, in the Dance Web, and other. In 1996, she received the Arts Link Fellowship residency and went to New York, where she worked with Yoshiko Chuma, with whom she collaborated until 2007. In New York, she got acquainted with the experimental scene there, which was a new artistic environment and challenge for her. During the late 1990s, Iskra's expression in choreography began to change. At the time, as a choreographer, she began to distance herself from the institutions and her creative work mostly took place outside of them. She began research in various concepts unrelated to the contemporary requirements and output of the codified institutional context.

She worked independently, pursuing her kinaesthetic interests in relation to the performing bodies she worked with, exploring form. She used actors and non-professional performers, creating performance contexts in which she questioned the language and form of communication between the performing bodies, and relations to a specific problem, venue, or object.

A major turn in her choreographic work followed with her MA studies at the Laban Centre in London, made possible by a scholarship from the British Council, where she wrote her thesis, 'The Dancing Body in Relation to Geometry in Space'. After her MA studies, she began to articulate her intuitions in relation to time, space, other bodies, and music pro-theoretically. Interested in geometry, the defragmentation of the human body, corporeal space, and body-space relations, she adopted a kinaesthetic approach based on certain postulates of Laban and Forsythe's research, using her own logic. In these pieces she „radically departed from the standardized ballet norms—with fresh and inventive solutions as a result" (Zdravkova-Dzaparoska, 2007 cited in Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, 2010, p.148).

Her background related to the knowledge of her co-workers enabled to extend the possibilities through which dance can be explored, researched, and experimented.

NGO Lokomotiva – Centre for New Initiatives in Arts and Culture in Skopje is offering a continuous programme of educational formations related, co-producing works by Macedonian authors, co-establishing a regional platform for contemporary dance Nomad Dance Academy, organizing different discursive programs related to contemporary dance, as well as larger socio-cultural problematics, and establishing the international festival of contemporary dance and performance, Locomotion (2008-2016). This festival exhibited a clearly profiling content and managed to grow its own audience. Besides this, Lokomotiva has worked on different programs for theoretical reflections, debates, discussions, and research of educational models,

artistic researches, as well as other programs developed with partners from the region of ex – Yugoslavia, as well as with international partners.

Both organizations are diametrically opposite in the methodological work, the aesthetics they represent, the structure of collaboration and organization. It is important to distinguish the diverse approaches and relations towards dance and choreography or/and politics of aesthetics, which affect the modes of working. Interarts is related to the ballet as aesthetic approach, as technique, and paradigm in which dance is produced as art form, and Lokomotiva is trying to reflect the dance needs emerging out of different contexts, being reflected through critical theory, cultural studies, sociology, rethinking the ways of collaboration, dance and choreography, and the system in which they are produced.

The emerging young authors which have been (are) collaborating with these two organizations develop their own specific approaches and styles, some relate to the direction which has been developed through them. However, many decide to pursue their careers outside the country, where the working conditions are significantly better.

Another significant change is the establishment of Nomad Dance Academy Macedonia, a new organization created by choreographers who were related to the Nomad Dance Academy regional platform for contemporary dance. [37] This is a young organization which is developing a specific model of collaboration among professionals in the field based on horizontal decision making and participatory decision making system.

Through the depicted examples we can peruse the structural basis in which contemporary dance has been formed and developed.

The choreography in Macedonia is still traditionally understood and very narrowly related to ballet and the entire dance spectrum. It is only used in a very small community of dance professionals, and developed as a larger field. Also, performance is related only to visual arts

[37] www.nomaddanceacademy.org

and it is not understood as performance art related to the postmodern traditions in the Western culture, or the 60s and the 70s related to the avant-garde Dadaism, Fluxus, conceptual art, and other, with the tendency to be antitheses of the theatre, challenging all traditional art and culture forms and norms, or dismantling the borders of discipline and introducing the "performing" as a common denominator.

The articulation of what constitutes dance, and what is the system in which dance can be developed in all its forms are questions to be addressed, especially in relation to the context specifics. When asking such questions, especially from the perspective of the cultural policies and management of dance, we need to analyse the "maturity" of the democratic system, social processes, political decisions, institutional dynamics, economic circumstances, cultural policy dynamics (on macro and micro level), as those determining dance as a social and cultural institution and aesthetic practice.

We could see through the Macedonian example how the economy of exchange is influencing the strata in which the art form has been communicated and developed. Political and social influences are strongly formulating the environment in which the art is positioned. Today, the stream of information through digital media and the available mobility grants are enabling the flux of information and the generation of new knowledge which facilitates diverse critical thinking and awareness about the control of the political and economic elite as dominant power machinery that directs the socio-cultural developments. Diverse knowledge empowers the cultural and art workers who are demanding and advocating for other than the already established systems of production, distribution, and thinking in culture and arts. Many projects around the globe are directed towards rethinking what is dance, choreography, or how we collaborate. Other than this, working conditions, systems of evaluation of art and culture, and models of institutions, among other, are inspected through confrontations with new and experimental methods produced in the field.

5. Performing the theoretical tools – The independent sector as a potential for new modelling

This Chapter provides the comparative analysis on examples of organizations situated in the independent cultural sector, the analysis of the organization framework, the protocols of work, decision-making structure, values produces, the procedures of work, the working conditions and their impact on the social reality.

Furthermore, I will try to analyse the organizational format that these initiatives use for their activities, their collaboration frameworks and exchange, as well as new methodological approaches in developing models of governing.

Alliances and networks are developed as for sharing information and knowledge, and creating a community to encounter and address certain dilemmas, problems, as well as to advocate for certain needs of the communities that they represent, or producing Gemeinschaft, as Pascal Gielen refers to the environment.

This chapter also presents the working processes and open working formats holding potentiality in their reformation, or adaptation, or re-modelling into a system that can be a cell for a further model in which new practices can be instituted. In this chapter, it is proposed that a potentiality for (re)formation or (re)modelling of new institutions can be found in the "independent cultural sector", which is experimenting or creating the post-managerial paradigm, as well as self-organized systems, heterogenic management systems, produces sociality, collaborative models, and thus, the co-institution or post-institution.

5.1 Independent organizations as temporary zones of critical reflection (case studies of Macedonia and the ex-Yugoslavia region)

In the post-Yugoslavian context, the sphere in which new modelling of the organizing, governing, producing, programming, and operating can be found is the independent sector, or the sphere of the civil society.

By independent here, I mean: a) initiatives based on new models of management, or practicing democratic models of governing, established bottom-up or as an idea of a certain community that shares goals, with the initiative by a certain group of people, and not by the government, state, or any external structure; b) the initiatives with their own system of decision-making, deciding independently without any external influence on the structure, management procedures, and other internal organizational matters; c) it does not depend on any other but its own decision for its financial and program matters; d) it is a counter point of the institutional sphere, and it is independently and critically rethinking the socio-cultural context and developed program content and activities in the field of contemporary art and culture. [38]

These organizations that I characterise as self-organized systems, or sub-systems, or part of the independent cultural sector, are part of the civil society sector, and they manifest the will and the interest of the citizens that they represent.

Nongovernmental organizations or non-profit (or not for profit) organizations can be regarded as synonyms, depending on the normative, or legal structure of the context.

The term *civil society* can be traced back to Aristotle's *Politics*, where he refers to a 'community', which enters into the Western political discourse through the translation of

[38] For more on independent culture, see Višnjić, E. and Dragojević, S. eds., 2008. *A Bottom Up Approach to Cultural Policy Making*, Zagreb: Policies for Culture, p.10, as well as JADRO – Assosiaton of independent cultural scene in Macedonia http://JADROasocijacija.org.mk/.

Aristotle's works into Latin (*societas civilis*). The term is revived in the recent times, regardless of being part of the state theory for a long time. Civil society has become the critical force, the reflective opposition and the part of society where many new methods, approaches, modes of work, and so on, were promoted, or the sphere of innovation, especially in Eastern Europe.

Civil society is composed of community and voluntary organizations, as well as social and activist movements. It is a product of modernity, which essentially means modes of social life. In the last decade, this term has been revitalized, and it has been embraced by many countries as a perspective model for a future organization of the society, or as a new phase in the democratic development. "It conveys the image of a free and vibrant public sphere, where tyranny has finally been laid to rest" (Powell, 2007, p.1).

In his introduction, Powell (2007) gives an overview of the civil society structures, organizations from different scholarly perspectives. He says that civil society exists when individuals and groups are free to form organizations that function independently and mediate between the citizens and the state. He offers Edward's perspective of five models, which present the general Left-Right division of the society as understood today (Powell, 2007, vii).

'Civil society' is a complex concept, it is widely used, and many authors describe its position in relation to other sectors of society to define it.

It is also equated with a third sector, or separate from other main sectors: state, family, and business. Legally, it is also found as private, however, it is distinguished from the private, commercial sector by its goals, working structures, as well as its role in the society. Other authors argue that family is not a separate sector, but it belongs to civil society. Some researchers use a different segmentation, distinguishing, for example, between political (state apparatus, political parties, and parliamentarians), economic (companies and markets), and

private spheres, and define it as a space where these spheres overlap (Paffenholz and Spurk, 2006, p.2).

Paffenholz and Spurk (2006) summarized it in the following definition or understanding of civil society:

- Civil society is the sector of voluntary action within institutional forms that are distinct from those of the state, family, and market, having in mind that in practice, the boundaries between these sectors are often complex and blurred;
- It consists of a large and diverse set of voluntary organizations, often competing with each other and oriented towards specific interests. It comprises non-state actors and associations that are not purely driven by private or economic interests, that are autonomously organized, and interact in the public sphere; and
- Civil society is independent from the state, but it is oriented towards and interacts closely with the state and the political sphere.

These divisions present a general overview of the sector that also has its own specificities differing by the context and the field in which they operate. Each field has its own complexity of relations and practices that are shaping it. In his text *Field of cultural production in Serbia*, Predrag Cvetičanin (2014) tries to reconstruct and analyse the field of cultural production in Serbia through the use of Bourdieu's concept of *field*, where he sees the contemporary societies formed by relatively *autonomous but structurally homologues* (similarities within differences) social fields. He maintains that there are as many fields as interests and vice versa, with consideration of economic, administrative, academic, religious, art field, and other. In Bourdieu's theoretical system, the notion *of field* is more powerful *than the institution*, and it comprehends: *social context, specific, relatively autonomous configuration of social relations in which practices are taking place.* Therefore, each *field* presents its own form of action, negotiation, and communication that are forming the relations and practices.

Therefore, each *field of art* also presents its own actions, conventions, communication channels, forms and modes which are creating the relations and practices, and thus, the environment and the *art world.*

The field of culture or, even more specifically, art in the civil sector has its own symbolism and forms characteristics through which it can be read. Moreover, the civil sector in culture, in a certain context, develops its own specificities that can be related or not to the same sector in another context. Moreover, each civil society in a certain context also has its own specificities.

Cvetičanin (2014) follows these analyses since, from his perspective, the notion of field in Bourdieu's terms is more suitable to be used in analyses of the cultural production (where the civil sector or the independent scene is situated) where border lines are not clear. He additionally explains that the field presents the conflictual character of the society, or the dissensus, while the existence of the institutions is based on the idea of the social consensus. The field is an arena for dissensuses organised around the specific form of capital: economic, cultural, scientific, or religious. They are structured as social spaces in which the struggle is between the actors of dominant and subordinated positions. The characteristics of each individual, group, organization, and the institutions- the actors, are formed through their relations. The struggle is between the established actors which are the owners of most of the capital following the *conservative strategies*, and those confronting them with *subversive strategies.*

He also talks about the different characteristics of the *field,* of which one is that they are structured through their own internal mechanisms. Therefore, the external influences on the actors in the specific field are never direct, but mediated through specific forms and forces acting in the field. The more autonomous or independent is one field, the more capable it is to intervene and influence its own logic of functioning. Namely, re-structuring of the external

effects is more significant. Cvetičanin (2014) underlines *that this is a fundamental methodological principle* through which the internal analyses of the field always have a primate in relation to the analyses of the external influences.

In addition, Cvetičanin (2014) explains the characteristics of the contemporary societies through Bourdieu's division of the source of power that is situated in two main capitals – the *economic* (as the dominant principle of hierarchy) and the *cultural* (the secondary principle of hierarchy). The relations in the field of power and other social fields are determined through the opposition of the economic and the cultural capital.

Bourdieu (1984) situates *cultural production* as an important part of the social space, in the field of power which is determined by the opposition between the *restricted production* and the field of *large-scale production*:

> The field of production per se owes its own structure to the opposition between the field of *restricted production* as a system producing cultural goods (and the instruments for appropriating these goods) objectively destined for a public of producers of cultural goods, and the field of *large-scale cultural production*, specifically organized with a view to the production of cultural goods destined for non-producers of cultural goods, 'the public at large'. In contrast to the field of large-scale cultural production, which submits to the laws of competition for the conquest of the largest possible market, the field of restricted production tends to develop its own criteria for the evaluation of its products, thus achieving the truly cultural recognition accorded by the peer group whose members are both privileged clients and competitors. (Bourdieu, 1984, p.4)

Independent cultural organizations in the civil sector can be situated in the field of restricted production, and according to Bourdieu (1984), the autonomy of this field can be measured by its power to define its own criteria for the production and evaluation of its products, which

implies translation of all external determinations in conformity with its own principles of functioning.

Independent cultural organizations can also be characterised by their critical approach and production of tools for critical reflection of their own actions, as well as the society which Bourdieu (1984) marks as a significant aspect of this field:

> It is significant that the progress of the field of restricted production towards autonomy is marked by an increasingly distinct tendency of criticism to devote itself to the task, not of producing the instruments of appropriation — the more imperatively demanded by a work the further it separates itself from the public — but of providing a 'creative' interpretation for the benefit of the 'creators'. (Bourdieu, 1984, p.5)

The logic of this field is to enhance experiment and innovation, and the avant-garde movements are located within it.

'Creative' interpretation for the benefit of the 'creators' in Bourdieu's words means readiness to step forward into imagining and rethinking methods of working, governing, producing, disseminating, collaborating, and so on, or re-modelling of the environment in which culture and art is situated. Therefore, by following Bourdieu's logic, one might say that the progressive approaches are possible in the field of *restricted production* or in the field striving for the autonomy where the principles are determent by themselves, or in Sheik's words, self-instituting is possible.

The contemporary performing art scene is one, or small part of the entire independent sector in arts. Yet, it is vibrant, with its specific working conditions, needs, relations, and communication modes. Therefore, it requires a specific institutional mode, or model. However, the independent cultural scene where these practices are (mostly) situated has its commonalities and specifics. In particular, this is the independent cultural scene related to the region of ex-Yugoslavia, where the experimental, new, or non-traditional, or contemporary

dance and choreography, or contemporary performing arts are situated. Therefore, before narrowing down the paradigm, we need to overview the context, or to have general analyses of the paradigm in which such arts are operating.

To depict the civil society, and also the cultural scene as part of it, I will use the empirical information from the study *Vaninstitucionalni akteri kulturne politike u Srbiji, Crnoj Gori i Makedoniji* (*Non-institutional agents of cultural policy in Serbia, Monte Negro and Macedonia*) by Predrag Cvetičanin (2009). This study classified the key cultural policy players/actors in these countries which are operating outside the system of public/cultural institutions, to measure their capacities, to map and estimate their power, and to start up the process of networking among these actors.

The classification was made in relation to two aspects: 1) organizational form, and 2) relations towards the institutional system, or the level of their independence. There are ten different forms of organizations. These include nongovernmental organizations, independent art organizations, cultural foundations, associations of artists, informal art groups, informal art groups with account, informal cultural initiatives, non-profit cultural clubs, café- clubs, non-profit cultural/concert agencies, non-profit schools (acting, dance, music) for children and youth. Their level of independence is varying. It has also been noticed that "phantom" organizations have been formed, especially in Macedonia. Such 'phantom' organizations are formed for a certain project call, getting a significant amount of money and then disappearing from the scene.

Therefore, the classification in relation to the independence is: *organizations as arm-length bodies of certain state organs/ political parties*, *organizations that are presenting the certain cultural institutions,* or are their *service for generation of funds, organizations as arm- length bodies of international companie*s which use their means for organization of cultural events, *organizations as fractions of international donors,* organizations which are *formed by people*

employed in the cultural institutions, unsatisfied with the work of the cultural institution and seeing a possibility to formulate their interests through NGO, and *organizations whose members are working professionally and earn for living in the NGO sector.* It can be noticed that some of the civil sector organizations function as “"outsourced" state apparatuses at the same time. Many art institutions belong to this category as well“ (Raunig, 2004).

These diverse aspects of existence of the civil sector in culture fragment it even more, and the only common denominator is that they are out of the institutional frame, or are not being part of the institutional sector. Such difference also makes the scene fragile, distances the organizations within it, and prevents them from networking and affiliating.

The research mentions three characteristics of the operational context of the non-institutional actors in Serbia, Monte Negro, and Macedonia: politization of the cultural sphere, its normative non-regulation, and instability (Cvetičanin, 2009, p.7).

From the general observation depicted above in the perspective of the thesis, organizations which are professional in this field dealing in the above mentioned circumstances, referred to as independent cultural sector organizations, are taken into consideration.

Other than ‘being out-of the institutional system’, they share similar approaches in organizing, or organization modes philosophy, as well as values they produce through their activities. What I also see as common for these examples is the will and attempt to apply “strategies of quality”, in terms of Šesić and Dragojević (2005), such as strategies of networking, collaborating, partnership, alliances for advocating, inter-sector collaboration, as strategies that would enhance the creation of a *culture of quality*. Furthermore, they work on developments of tactics, or a tactical approach that is relevant for the context in which they operate.

The use of the referred strategies is relevant in their long-term planning on the one hand, but tactical solutions are the important asset used to create direct impacts in the constantly

changing environment. *Culture of quality* is creation of a centre of excellence in the independent sector, especially in the field of culture. It is an approach based on mutual support of organizations, and not on rivalry. However, it does not exclude competition. The creation of *culture of quality* is an ongoing process in the context of ex-Yugoslavia.

Continuing with the analysis of the organizational mode of this sector, which from my perspective holds the examples of new modelling to be instituted, I will try to address several different examples and approaches in the Macedonian context. From the perspective of Cvetičanin, it can be seen that this sector is non-aligned since it is diversified. However, this small segment I take into the consideration tries to affiliate and collaborate. Nevertheless, in the circumstances which are burdened with partization[39] of the cultural sphere, the forms of independent action and affiliation are brought under scrutiny. The experiences thus far seem to have induced phobia regarding any form of consolidation. There might be an excuse for this, since the most powerful model of joint action seems to be the political party, which is the most negative example. Or, through this example, it becomes evident how the voice can be silenced, or how many can be subordinated and manipulated.

In order to outline specific independent organizations in Macedonia, it is necessary to provide a brief overview of the general directions of cultural policy development in Macedonia in the past 10 years during the conservative, right – wing government.

- At the beginning of the governing, no explicit cultural policies, therefore, an open field for interpretations;
- Creation of the National Strategy for cultural development 2013-2017[40] with dominant orientation towards traditional art, archaeology, and cultural heritage;
- Minimal and no significant support to new contemporary art practices;

[39] Being controlled by the ruling party in power through employment of party recognized and selected people; especially in the administration, but also in the public institutions.

[40] http://www.kultura.gov.mk/index.php/component/content/category/60

- No transparent decision making - sums of subsidies assigned were never presented transparently;
- Closed institutions – centralized decision-making structures (institution politics depending on the general manager (through a party in power delegated position);
- Larger funds for culture – capital investments (monuments, buildings, and other construction works) used for recreation of the national identity through cultural symbols mostly extracted from the imagined past, Skopje 2014 project;
- Clientelism, partization and cultural centralisation;
- Marginalized civil sector as counterpart, highly suppressed, only 'phantom' organizations, or several organizations close to the government in power;
- *Implicit censorship*, or deliberate, planned, strategic negligence and no support to certain organizations in culture that were loud, or critical, with the aim to dismantle them and their position, and bring them on the edge of existence.

Moreover, the general context is marked by high division of the society in patriots and traitors, bringing up the paranoia that some invisible external powers are destabilising our country. At the same time, only supporters of the nationalistic agenda were visible through the occupied media, and thus, financially supported. Furthermore, the clientelism made those in power rich, while poverty was on the rise in the country. As noted in the study *Wealth and poverty in Macedonia 2008- 2011* by the leftist movement Solidarity[41] (during the last elections part of its membership became the political party Levica[42]), every fourth family in Macedonia says that their monthly income is not sufficient, or they cannot afford anything else besides covering basic needs. That is, the 'relative poverty', which is one level higher than the 'absolute poverty', presents those families that do not have sufficient income to

[41] http://solidarnost.mk/
[42] https://levica.mk/

satisfy even their basic needs. People have also lost their jobs during the privatisation of the factories and become bankruptcy workers who do not have a job, or any, or below the average social help from the state.

In such circumstances, many of the values have been shook, since the larger population is striving for survival, choosing the easiest way out of hardship - through the party in power.

Furthermore, in such circumstances, the context of culture is even more “partizied”, or it is organized by the party in power through giving jobs to people who are part of the political ruling party, and not to the professionals suitable for the job. In the context of the partization of culture in Macedonia, or the partization of cultural institutions, the space for diverse opinion is contested, and this space can only be produced in the independent sector of culture (as mentioned above, part of the civil sector organizations in culture). This space was significantly jeopardized in the last few years, since there was no continuous support of such strategy of creation of a counter culture in the sense of an environment where new values can be developed and sustained. In the past year, the situation changed. The political party in power became the social democratic ruling coalition. However, it is still a short period to comment on possible changes and benefits. Therefore, I will stick to the period of a decade which made significant impact on the context in which the independent scene in culture is operating.

These circumstances have also brought low quality sectors to the institutional cultural sphere. Many managers have not been able to operate with the institutions, and were also closed for dialogue. Such ‘partization of culture’ had a catastrophic impact in the long-term. In the past year, with the change of the government, and the social democratic party coming to power, it can be seen that there is a slight change of politics towards employment of people who are educated and suitable for the jobs, or who come from the independent sector. Such change is due to the negotiations with the representatives from the civil society presented as part of the

"Colorful revolution" (Ozimec, 2017) against the previous government. I cannot comment on the results of this change since there is a short proximity. However, some of the employed in the government, or some of the Members of Parliament are part of the civil sector. Others from the independent sector also are being employed (working either under permanent contracts or under honorarium contracts) in the public institutions, but not a significant number so far. However, there is a trend, and one might say that such a trend can harm or weaken the independent cultural sector, or bring forward the culturalisation of politics (Grlja and Vesić, 2007). This might also be seen as a way of giving up of the political struggle, or:

> Since culture has become some kind of a radical hybrid place in which any kind of essentialism is no longer possible, things are not happening any more in a 'real' time and place, but in the field of culture. Boris Buden illustrates this contradiction between politics and culture with the following example of a postcolonial story about antinationalism, pointing to the paradox that antinationalism is always discussed from some national state: "we have the possibility to express out loud the antinationalism cultural, while at the same time we keep quiet politically."[43] Civil-public partnership in the field of culture and intersectorial interweaving are slow steps in the certain and 'democratic' way of the Balkan countries into the new post-political condition" (Prnjat 2018)

Another weakness is the fragmentation of the general civil sector that also puts it in a scarce position. There is a new activist approach that builds a radical opinion on how the sector is developed, or what it represents today. The civil society, in general, is accused by the leftists, or some representatives of the civil movements, collectives, or organizations – of being composed of:

[43] See: http://eipcp.net/transversal/1206/buden/en/#_ftn5

> NGO bureaucrats and "seminar educated" CSO activists who are mingling in the intellectual circles, and who are the first to run towards the profitable gold mine of the Western Maecenas – stacked in the intention to be liked by the educated public, forgetting that the Public is a much larger category. (Apasiev, 2012)

Part of the active organizations are criticized to be a group of erudite people who have gathered to become the "public", not understanding that the Public is a space for discussion and action in which society(etal) is always present. Another critique goes in the direction of the fulfilment of the foundation goals, or the top-bottom politics in that direction (Apasiev, 2012).

Such attitude also continues in the political arena today, and is confronting the scheme of international financing. It has been misused by the last government as a campaign against George Soros, who has been the largest supporter of the civil society in the country since the 90s. In general, international donors have been under attack, and they have been the only resource that was a counter pillar which allowed the independence in the management, decision making procedures, and programming, and enabled these organizations to sustain. Publicly produced confrontation in an already mistrustful political atmosphere does not produce a dialogue, or constructive criticism, but it produces a negative image of foundations and CSO, and puts the sector in an even more fragile situation. Such generalisation of the situation of the sector, or such approach and positioning, jeopardize the position of the already fragile organizations in the cultural sphere as part of the civil society.

As far as the foundations are concerned, there were only several international foundations operating in the cultural sphere. Their general politics shifted in the past years, and most of them changed their focus, leaving without the "sustaining the sector" scenario. The foundations were being implicit policy makers for the civil sector for many years, even though some of them had been open to partnership and dialogue in defining their programs

that enormously affected the cultural sector as a whole. Also, some foundations have begun their own projects and agendas, which has also changed the atmosphere in which the sector operated.

Also, the policy of the EU has even further jeopardized the independent sector in such an environment by strongly bringing forward the scenario for the development of the creative industries sector, in a space without regulation of labour laws, undeveloped domestic market, and systems of governing within this sector. Furthermore, this trend has impacted the cultural policy of the state, which was striving towards *cultural mercantilism* by creating trends, commodification of services and products, marginalizing the *cultural functionalism* as a model that would enhance the cultural development (Dragićević Šešić and Dragojević, 2005, p.20).

In such an environment, the most challenging questions were, and still are, the following: how to organize, how to govern, or how to consolidate in order to create spaces, organizations of/for intervention? What are the strategies and/or tactics to be employed (in addition to the mentioned "strategies of quality") in order to produce and sustain the "culture of change, intervention and quality"[44]?

Today, on the one hand, there is the apathy of the sector, especially considering that some have gained high reputation through program excellence, recognized by the cultural public, being supported for many years by the largest foundations present, and forced to deploy the survival tactics in the local context. Most of the organizations have become a one–person organization, or some have even been terminated, which creates de-professionalization of the

[44] This is proposed as complementation to the culture of quality by Dragićević Šešić and Dragojević. It is an attempt to define a context in which critical reflection is the action through which contemporary art is produced. More about how i see it and define it will be described in the subsequent chapters.

sector.[45] Others are changing the tactics, struggling, still being on the edge of survival since there are still no significant policy changes for support of the independent cultural sector. Positive changes have been announced through newly introduced measures in the new National Strategy for cultural development in the Republic of Macedonia for 2018 – 2022, although their implementation has not started yet. [46]

This situation brings forward several questions: Is such a situation depicting the symptoms of the scene, the field, such as fatigue, conflicts, or perhaps a lack of new management and leadership skills, or fragmentation of the artistic and creative potentiality, lack of vision in the organizations, or solidarity with each other? How to generate sustainable models of organizations and institutions that would not jeopardize the quality and content in such turbulent circumstances? What are the approaches to influence quicker or larger policy changes in favour of the field of *restricted production*?

Thus, how can professionals with critical power be supported in the "relative poverty society" transitioning for years into capitalistic neoliberal state, and developing an implicit culture of mercantilism? How to bring the progressive powers in this sector, or how to bring the theories of institutional and organizational change, is a challenge.

[45] De-professionalization in this sense is connected with the organizations where people are working professionally in the sector and are being paid for their work. This is one important aspect of the organizations' sustainability. De-professionalization in such sense is related to losing these employed professionals who must obtain the basics for their personal existence since the field cannot provide it (reasons explained above).

46 http://www.kultura.gov.mk/index.php/legislativa/60-2013-02-27-10-20-24

5.2 Analysis of the independent sector in culture in the region – new tactics and strategies

In observing, as well as analysing the interviews[47], it can be seen that there is a potent side produced by the tactics of survival which are accompanying the values referred to by the interviewees.

The independent cultural sector is a specific part of the civil society, and it has particular procedures and protocols of work that create practices which its actors are characterizing through the following values, goals, working modes: *solidarity, equality, justice, mutual aid and empathy, sharing, critical thinking, the 'art of the discussing', political education, freedom of speech and artistic expression, collectivity, responsibility, trust, commons, anti-consumerism, social justice, ecology, anti-capitalism, supporting marginalized groups, supporting LGBT rights, animal rights, promoting alternative models of living, inclusion, horizontal working modes, exchange/sharing of knowledge, open source, continuity in exchange (long-term projects; long-lasting relationships with artists, curators, and organizations that share our interest and vision), new economics of exchange, diversity…*

[47] Interviews with actors from the independent sector in Macedonia, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, and Germany were conducted in order to evaluate the organization models, principles of work, values, conditions of work, as well as the position of the organizations in the cultural context. Also, they were used for comparative analysis of the mentioned aspects. The following interviews were used in this chapter's analysis (Ana Jovkovska, Ana Todorovska AKSC, Skopje; Gjorgji Pulevski, Kontra Kadar, Bitola; Anita Ivkovic, CAC, Skopje; Iskra Geshoska, Kontrapunkt, Skopje; Yane Chalovski, press to exit project space, Skopje; Filip Jovanovski, Fakultet za raboti shto ne se uchat, Bitola;(Macedonia) and Lovro Rumiha, BADCO, Zagreb, Croatia; Marijana Cvetkovic, Stanica, Belgrade, Serbia; and Angelina Georgieva, New Dramaturgies Platform, Sofia, Bulgaria; Jasmina Zaloznik, Cona, institute for contemporary arts processing, Ljubljana, Slovenia, and Gisela Muler, Tanzfabrik, Berlin, Germany (used also for analysis of specific organizations in the field of contemporary performing arts).

The working protocols in this sector are seen as something that can be performed, something with potentiality, as a way in which the procedures are performed in reference to a certain *platform. A Platform* is understood as the body of convictions, expectations, knowledge, the ways of posing problems, or ways of typical problem solving shared by a community of practitioners and theorists.

The platform is also seen as an epistemological site of establishing knowledge and, more importantly, a way in which such knowledge is applied. And, to apply knowledge does not only mean to possess knowledge, or to bring it somewhere or to something that lacks it, but also to demonstrate that there is knowledge in everything one deals with, and that it can be generated with each new action, and to show that knowledge is a precondition of action (Šuvaković, 2010).

In this regard, I see the following examples as part of the platform, or as a trampoline for starting a certain action.

5.2.1 New tactics and strategies for development in the independent cultural scene

The independent organizations in culture in Macedonia, presented here, are selected through several criteria related to the above mentioned depiction of the independent cultural sector. Their work is regulated through the specific model generated bottom-up, decision-making is independent of any external influences, they decide independently of their own program, and they can be seen as a platform or a body that shares a set of values, convictions, expectations, knowledge, ways of posing problems, or ways of problem solving shared by a community in it. Or, they can be seen as epistemological sites of establishing and distributing knowledge.

Being a practitioner in the field from the 90s until today, the following is depicted through observation, as well as analysis of empirical results from direct participation in the activities of the scene.

Here, the interest is to overview the situation and the organizational aspects of organizations in the independent cultural scene, or to analyse if such working principles, methods of collaboration, dialogue, production, and so on, can be used as examples of modes or processes - to be instituted - to a model of an institution.

In relation to the thesis, the work of the organizations in relation to the public space will be observed, or the space(s) as an environment where established processes are realized or actions are effectuated – to be visible.

In the past (the period between 2000 and 2010) I identify two strategies of development of the organizations in the independent sector: 1. *creation of new spaces*, and 2. *creation of temporary platforms* within the institutions.

From 2010, another approach and trend can be identified – *networking or affiliations* and *development of the co-governing models (public-private-civil partnership).*

The first strategy is related to organizations using the 'externalisation' strategy, and oriented on developing projects, or models of organizing directly connected to *a space*. They identify their program, or the activities of the organization with the infrastructure which would make their programs more visible and articulated, and thus enable continuity. To a certain extent, they might be considered as unstable institutions[48] or organizations, spaces where they are open to change, having dynamic boundaries, and breathing with the city and the environment.

[48] In terms of the division to stable (traditional) and unstable (alternative) spaces (Hirsch et al., 2006, p.50).

They are not sites, but live environments where new content and knowledge is produced and contested.

Others were situated into the *creation of temporary platforms* with the existing spaces, institutions where they situated their programs. This was possible with the institutions up to a certain point in Macedonia. Later, the institutions were closed for collaboration, as mentioned in the analyses of the cultural policies 2006-2017.

From 2010, a new approach can be identified – *networking or affiliations* and *co-governing* models development also related to the goal of developing the independent cultural sector. It can be seen that there are varieties in the tactics used, which are depicting the socio-political situations in which these strategies have been effectuated.

The organizations used as examples below also shift from one to another strategy in different periods of time.

5.2.1.1 Creation of new spaces – enhancing the visibility of the independent sector

The organizations which were oriented towards the *creation of new spaces* have used this strategy for the development of their programs and organizations. This has been an attempt to overcome the uncertainty of relations with institutions as spaces where programs can be implemented. Furthermore, on a different level, it has been an attempt to oppose the internalisation of critique, to enable self-parrhesia[49], or what Foucault referred to as "practices

[49] I have referred to Milevska here, since I have read the term in the mentioned text, where she is relating it to the context relevant for the thesis. Also, later on I have read more in this relation in the text by Gerald Rauning: *The Double Criticism of parrhesia. Answering the Question "What is a Progressive (Art) Institution?* http://www.republicart.net/disc/institution/raunig04_en.htm However, parrhesia is a hellenic concept, and a term that has been analysed by Faucault, especially concerning his development of the concept of an "aesthetics of existence" in the books, lectures, and interviews following the publication of his *History of Sexuality: The*

of self-formation". The creation of new spaces has led to the attempt for creating a possibility to articulate autonomous actions and existence of certain art forms. However, creation of the spaces in the analyses below will depict the tactics (how they were formed) of forming spaces effectuated through *partnerships* with different entities: private, governmental, and international foundations.

There were few organizations in Macedonia that attempted to establish innovative centres or spaces of culture that would also serve as a space for the creation of a new community and re-reading contemporary art and culture (in the period before 2015). These are:

- *Cultural Centre Tocka*, which was created as a project generated by the members of the organization Kontrapunkt. It was run independently through an internally generated structure, and it was supported through international foundations. This centre was initially located in a private building, and it was sustained by international donations. After some time of negotiating with the government, in 2002, Tocka was relocated into another building, a space which was given for use through an agreement with the government of R. Macedonia represented through the Ministry of Defence. Tocka worked in full capacity for the next few years, and after the change of the government, it was closed since the agreement was cancelled. Today, this space remains abandoned, and not used. Kontrapunkt continued with the projects, in limitied capacities.
- *Press to exit project space* was a specific space, an artist run space, a multipurpose gallery created on the initiative of few individuals, run by artists. P*ress to exit project space* was supported as a project space by the international foundation Prohelvetia, as a special program of the foundation. The infrastructure or the gallery space belonged

---

Will to Knowledge, as well as other philosophers. As a practice, it demands orientation towards the truth, and becomes crucial to the aesthetics of existence. Parrhesiastic discourse — literally, "speaking truthfully" — functions as a means of relating oneself truthfully to the present situation and to others.

to the Swiss Embassy in Skopje, where the Prohelvetia foundation was accommodated. The gallery space was at the front of the space, and behind it there were the offices of the Prohelvetia foundation. It was situated in the centre of Skopje, and as such, it was a unique space. After few years of successful programming and recognition by the professional national and international community, as well as the audience, it was closed by the Ambassador of Switzerland in 2007. The Ambassador was not satisfied with the work of the project (press to exit project space) supported by the Prohelvetia, evaluating it as an inadequate program to the aims of the Swiss Embassy politics. The space was later used as a shop for office supplies, and it is now a coffee-bookstore.

- *CK (Centre for Culture)* was created as a space not related with one specific foundation support, and it was run through an internally generated structure of the founding organization Centre for Drama Arts THouse. CK was situated in the private building that was previously used by Tocka. It was a space actively running for four years, and it then terminated its activities since the founders of the space, as well as the people who ran the centre were employed in some national institutions and in the creative industries sector. Such changes came after they decided that there is no possibility to sustain the space and program through commercial and project activities.
- CAC (Contemporary Arts Centre) ran the *Gallery Kurshumli An* and was created by a contract among the Ministry of Culture and the Museum of Macedonia, with the aim to enable the development of autonomous programming of the gallery among CAC and the Museum of Macedonia. The contract was signed between CAC and the Museum, supported with the decision of the Ministry of Culture in 2003 for 5 years. Unfortunately, the contract was terminated a year earlier, in 2007. CAC ran the gallery space in one of the buildings that belong to the Museum, known as Kurshumli An.

This is an old Turkish An, that represents a monument of culture, protected by the law and used as a space for the Museum's activities. CAC developed its own program for the development of the contemporary visual arts scene, running through an open call for visual artists who could propose their project to be exhibited and presented in the gallery, selected by a jury. They have supported the selected emerging artists both financially and logistically, enabling their visibility on national and international level. The program of CAC within the Museum space enabled a larger audience, as well as affirmation of the institution and the old part of the town (Old Bazaar). Due to political clashes among the Albanians and the Macedonians in 2001, this part of the town was nearly doomed, and was revitalised through different activities, among which is this Gallery. I have selected this Gallery among the principal strategies regardless of the fact that it was part of the infrastructure of institution, since the space created gave another map of the city or enabled different cultural mapping, being a space of dynamic boundaries, a live environment. However, it is also noteworthy to mention that this space was closed due to a change of government and re-adaptation of the space into the Institute of Albanian spiritual and cultural heritage which was modified in office space. Few months later, the Institute left the space, which was given for use to the Turkish Cultural Centre that is no longer active.

Today, CAC runs a mobile gallery, a project-space, a movable gallery space that is located in the park of the Francophonie in Skopje. The Gallery was moved and used for the Akto festival in Bitola, among other.

These spaces of self-parrhesia or *unstable intuitions*, were conceptualized as spaces for contemporary culture and art, being live environments for *arts presentations*: exhibitions, films projections, theatre performances, and other, but also as *discursive spaces* for debates,

conferences, workshops, or *spaces for socialization* where certain communities of condividuals (Raunig, 2011) were gathering and being generated.

The common in these approaches was based on:

- *Consensual collaboration with institutions*

* by formation *of partnerships* with different entities we can witness different tactics and strategies based on the goal to create a space for the independent cultural scene. All spaces were created with the aim to oppose the manner of collaboration as within the public institutions in the 90s, oriented towards joint programming which brought power to the institutions, and to create spaces as counter–spaces where critical thinking, production of common knowledge, values and collective(ness) can be enhanced. The establishment of the Kurshumli An gallery by CAC within the cultural institution did not support joint programs, but co-coordinated the space by independent programming.

Different partnerships with institutions were established[50], but they were all based on protecting the independence in the programming and decision-making of the spaces.

- *redefinition and invention of modes of arts production*

These organizations were opposing the processes oriented only towards products, inventing the formats in which the experimental, or limainality, the open space, the potentiality can be nurtured in order to support the processes, the potentiality, the developmental phases instead of a machinery of product making.

- *Visibility of contemporary art*

[50] The agreement between Tocka and the Ministry of Defence was based on an agreement to transform an abandoned space into a cultural centre. *Common goal* - development of independent cultural space; Press to exit project space had project support and agreement with Prohelvetia and the Swiss Embassy for use of the space to develop an independent space for contemporary culture. *Common goal* - development of independent gallery space. The agreement between CAC and the Museum of Macedonia was based on an agreement to develop an independent gallery for contemporary art. *Common goal* – independent gallery space.

The independent scene was a generator of new collaboration, production, and creation processes that were dispersed in different places, not having sites where they can be traced or located. With the establishment of these spaces, the independent cultural scene acquired homes which enabled larger visibility of the organizations as founders. However, it also enabled access to other initiatives from the sector.

These spaces did not sustain due to political and economic reasons, or de-professionalization of the sector. All these spaces were closed.

This proves that normative procedures do not work in politically unstable environments. Moreover, the independent public spaces, or contemporary institutional models, are only possible in a democratic system, where the power is redistributed among equal stakeholders. All spaces were closed by top-down decisions that underlined the position of power, or who is in power, and even further emphasized the marginal position of the cultural workers and artists.

The above depiction is an archive of memories, or of attempts to create several "excesses" into the cultural sphere, the environment that would enhance the development of cultural needs and values of "culture of change, intervention and quality".

All parties participating in this partnership did not equally approach the aim. The political bodies involved were democratically immature, and the organizations did not realize that this societal threat would be the one that would make them weak, and prevent their development or sustainability. Foundations as partners enabled these spaces, as "excesses", to come to life, and had a significant role, both positive and negative.

The positive role of the foundation is found in the recognition and support of the attempt to produce new approaches in modelling cultural programming as critical space in which the culture and art is produced. This policy intervention enhanced the scene development as relevant ((self-)critical and interventional). Nevertheless, this was a time-framed and top-

down intervention that did not succeed in empowering the independent cultural scene through certain processes to sustain. The project – based support of visionary ideas (that need strategic approach and support on infrastructural rather than on project basis) as a policy agenda created isolated interventions that failed to achieve the expected outcomes and impact. However, the responsibility is not on one side, or on the side of the foundations only, but also on the civil sector that accepted and allowed such policies, without a critical reflection on them. Furthermore, self-reflection on these processes is necessary as a relevant evaluation that could positively affect the forthcoming ideas.

What to reflected upon is:

- What position should organizations oriented towards the creation of "culture of change, intervention and quality" take in relation to the foundations that are intervening in geopolitical contexts relations and development?
- What governing strategies of these organizations were not developed, or not well-implemented, thus leading to failed scenarios?
- Were the threats in the politically turbulent environment such as Macedonia underestimated?
- What should the future strategies or methodologies be in the development of the public spaces and institutions in culture?

Organizations have developed partnership relations with all foundations, as well as with the representative governments. Foundations driven by the geopolitical situation, as well as by the policies in their representative countries, have finished their mandates and withdrawn from Macedonia. Foundations such as Prohelvetia later reformed in the Swiss Cultural Program have always included local staff, as well as national representatives in their board. They have used all possible mechanisms to generate the ideas bottom – up, and have been open to

suggestions on the support lines development. Prohelvetia directly supported the development of Cultural Centre Tocka, as well as press to exit project space.

The situation with the most influential organization ECF (European Cultural Foundation) was different. They have not been present on a local level, but they have been coordinating from Amsterdam. However, they were always engaging local professionals as advisors in the selection committees, as well as in the planning groups for the development of their supporting programs. Some years ago, ECF decided to delegate the responsibility for the Balkan Incentive Fund (oriented towards support of regional collaboration in the Balkan Region) to organizations in the region. This fund merged with support from the SDC (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation) and was operating as BAC (Balkan Art Cooperation), supporting regional cooperation in the Balkans, and ran by the Art Angle organization. It was closed at the end of 2017. There is no longer funding by ECF that supports the ex-Yugoslavia collaboration in culture. An exit strategy was not announced. ECF was active in supporting different programs ran by the civil society, and through its program Kultura Nova it supported the development of the Cultural Location „Mesto“.

Another perspective can be seen through the political instruments developed by foundations, indirectly positioning the civil society as an important societal pillar. Therefore, foundations played a significant role in the development of the civil sector in culture, implicating the implicit policies dimensions. Apart from the mentioned foundations, one foundation operating on a national level is FOSM (Foundation Open Society Macedonia), which is part of the Soros network in Central and Eastern Europe. For the past decade, this foundation has not directly supported culture. However, it has supported the development of civil society and, indirectly, certain activates of organizations in the field of culture. FOSM has supported the Gallery Kurshumli An, as well as CK THouse for some period.

The presented organizations did not gain large visibility for many reasons. First, this was because of the lack of political will to recognize this sector just as relevant as other sectors. Organizations did not gain political power, having been considered as small payers in the political space in Macedonia. Therefore, they were not economically and politically influential to sustain these spaces. The developed strategies were not relevant for the politically turbulent space where the basic democratic governance parameters remain un-established. Tactical approaches and actions have been considered, but have not changed the output. Here again, the only conclusion is that the power is not redistributed equally among all actors in the field, and therefore, such spaces remain as archives of socio-cultural processes enabling certain impacts in the context.

However, these organizations were socially and culturally influential. This generated new cultural (introduction to new art forms, content, and understanding of other cultures, offering relevant content to local audiences), social (belonging, shared contacts, created networks, increased trust among the community, and desire to share), physical (access to events, workshops, innovative models of collaboration, programs), and human (increased number of people participating in the programs, development of skills, diversity of working capacities) capital. The above mentioned projects/spaces created memory and legacy for the community, an archive of lessons learned that are examples by which future strategies can be built. They are the focal point from which new initiatives should articulate new approach towards the cultural system development.

What is also important as part of these processes, are the values of common created around those spaces, as mentioned above: solidarity, self-organization, collaboration, self-education,

and creation of open spaces for critical reflection of the socio-political and cultural environment, as well as self- criticism (to a certain extent), among other.

These spaces were *spaces for socialisation incorporating the ideas of community, liminal/liminoid, temporality, excess, production, real time, emancipation, present-absent, transformation, transfiguration, intertextuality, local, national, regional, international, ideology, margin, centre, power, anti-utopia, otherness, meaning, sign, deterritorialisation, transnational, transitivity, fractalisation, (de)construction, relaxation, new, punctuation, network…* (Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, Veljanovska and Vaseva, 2013, p.354).

They also made a significant impact on the art production processes through confronting the comodification of culture by prioritizing the public needs, positioning themselves against dominant and politically implied market needs.

5.2.1.2 Temporary platforms with institutions

On the other hand, other organizations which operated at the same time and context employed different strategies of development not related to the creation of physical spaces, but a temporary excess into the established institutional or spatial context.

The post 2006 institutional context become a centred, authoritarian, homogeneous, self-sufficient, non-participative, and self-centred segment of society. Such platforms or excesses of collaboration have destabilised the institutions in their production mode. However, without implying any change in the operational mode.

Even though these collaborations, or *temporary platforms with the institutions,* were supported by the institutions with an aim to justify the "freedom of programming" or democracy in programming, and moreover independence, they still depend on the personal (director) will and goal. There was only one institution as an exception in my opinion, and

that is the Youth Cultural Centre. Some actors from the independent cultural scene become part of it. Thus, this institution had different politics towards collaboration and partnership with the civil society organizations, mostly with organizations from the independent cultural scene.

The organizations that I give as examples in this group have developed strategies of partnerships with institutions, or *temporary platforms with the institutions* (cultural, as well as other local institutions and authorities). These were the Performing Arts Centre (PAC) Multimedia, Lokomotiva- Centre for New Initiatives in Arts and Culture, Line Initiative, (Skopje) and "Fakultet za raboti koi ne se uchat" (Faculty for the things that you can't learn) (Bitola), among other.

These organizations produced the same values (as in the case of the spaces) through employing the tactics of creating the "excesses", but within the institutional space and program.

They have used their program timeframe and its "temporality" to emphasise its openness and excessiveness, in order to establish new unities, based on new practices that had a potentiality to reshape the institutional context. They used strategies of internalisation of the programs. These programs enabled contemplating of the new formats and contents minimising the gap between the creators, audiences, and the institution. Or rather, programs could become unconscious of such gap, or of the traditional distribution of the places, roles, and positions in the institution because acknowledging the gap only makes it wider and, more difficult to bridge, to paraphrase Rancière. On the one hand, these programs enabled different distribution of experiences and networking, providing an opportunity to gradually transform some rather anachronous contexts by means of offering short-term experiences with "other(s)". However, temporality further consolidates the short-term character and marks the shallowness of the system by withholding space and time, which in turn thwarts any deeper contemplation and

re-examination, that is, reforming the institution in new spaces for problematic/critical thinking.

These temporary platforms with the institutions fostered temporality, transience, and may even be called heterotopias.[51]In his fourth principle Foucault explains:

> Heterotopias are most often linked to *slices in time* – which is to say that they open onto what might be termed, for the sake of symmetry, heterochronies. The heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time. Furthermore, he explains, there are different types of heterotopias: [t]here are those linked, on the contrary, to time in its most flowing, transitory, precarious aspect, to time in the mode of the festival.
>
> These heterotopias are not oriented toward the eternal; they are rather absolutely temporal [*chroniques*]. (Foucault, 1967)[52]

At this point, one may ask about the meaning of partnerships with the institutions. Are such partnerships supposed to be producing new policies meant to affect temporality, superficiality, systems of governing, or parameters of work propagated by the establishment? Or, are they emerging as a result of the need to use temporality and space outside of time to generate continuous excess that might open up, always mindful of its context, space not only for reflecting, but also for changing that institutional context from within?

Can these temporary platforms present the 'Space of Appearance', within which a form of certain political action takes place that is not just ephemeral and based on speech as action,

---

[51] Foucault 1967: "real places – places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society – which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted".

[52] Although the concept of heterotopia is used in a different context here, I read Foucault's text while being part of project deschooling clasroom, developing this thesis in other context (text about festivlas mentioned in futnotes), however in this moment, talking about the temporarlity come back to me since I think it introduces and explains some of the relations that I am are trying to elaborate.

but it also firmly rests on 'acting without a model' and on making 'its means as visible as possible'.[53] Rogoff (2006) proposes that 'spaces of appearance' can be applied on spaces other than exhibitions. [54] I think that, to a certain extent, such temporary platforms can form an arena for such enactments, whereby the possibility of another political space arises. If we also see these platforms as a political space, then we can think that it is a space where potentiality lies and 'they do not bear the markings of traditional political spaces but rather galvanise the spaces of everyday life and temporarily transform them by throwing flitting mantles of power over them' (Rogoff, 2006). Being part of the institutional context, these spaces transform and re-cognise values and suggest political or policy measures, still being places of self – parrhesia.

Using the processes of generating and producing the new knowledge as an external tool for interventions in the institutional context, or internalising the processes within the institutions, these temporary platforms have been a symbolic creation of the 'other spaces of action' within the institutions. These platforms that shift from civil to public and back, insist on this duality, and thus keep their autonomy, secured by its political attitude, by mutualities (in Rogoff's terms), through permanent self-reflection and self- organized structures.

However, these 'spaces of appearances' or new spaces of action did not sustain as a policy outcome, or institutional reformation. They are also only archives of temporary created heterotopias, or excesses into the traditionally governed institutions.

---

[53] In 'WE: Collectivities, Mutualities, Participations' Irit Rogoff uses Hannah Arendt's 'space of appearance' to suggest the meaning of exhibition, and further on she states: 'If we can accept the space of the exhibition as the arena for such enactments, in which it is we the audience who produce the meanings through our "being" and our acknowledgement of mutualities and imbrications – *then what we have is the possibility of another political space*. Instead of an occasion for the translation of various sets of politics into the realm of aesthetics and language, instead of a series of exercises in moral navigations that take place in and through the art exhibition, we have the possibility of an actual political space tout court'.

[54] Rogoff explains that meaning is never produced in isolation or through isolating processes but rather through intricate webs of connectedness.

These organizations continued with their programs, still recreating the possibility for sustaining the temporary platforms with some institutions, but without positioning themselves as politically influential, in the sense of producing the explicit policy changes to be affected into the institutional modelling. Others started using the other strategy or the creation of new spaces as spaces for self-parreshia and production of socialites.

How these strategies and tactics can be potent, or how they can be articulated in practice is a question for analyses.

Therefore, I will inspect a few aspects of these platforms.

The common in these platform approaches was:

- *New tactics of collaborative dissensus* (creating partnerships which are not based on common understanding, methodology, or consensus, but dissensus as an approach, or dissensus from a centralised order that marginalizes and excludes);
- *Creation of explicit policy* (they have been active in the creation of certain strategies on local, regional level, which have officially become the official documents for cultural development, or producing art that is visible and constituted as part of the larger scene);
- *Re-distribution of power in public space* (qualitative approach towards the public through their engagement as users or stakeholders, producing a participant instead of a passive observer of the institutional content).

5.3 Analyses and outcomes of both approaches (the strategies of creation of spaces and temporary platforms)

Both of the given examples shared several outcomes, from the creation of communities, social spaces to new discourses, models and tactics for development of contemporary art and culture, investing into the creation of human, cultural, physical, and social capital.

They have been opposing the customised institutional behaviour of indulgency, reflected through indolent behaviour or stagnation into the habitual modelling and programming, being oriented towards the past and closed for new practices and approaches.

Can these approaches form a larger space of self–parrhesia and become a relevant intervening force into the change of the governing institutional structure? In his text *The Double Criticism of parrhesia. Answering the Question "What is a Progressive (Art) Institution?*, Raunig (2004) is trying to elaborate the different aspects of parrhesia, diversifying the political from the personal one, proposing the following:

> The function of the *parrhesiastes* undergoes a similar change analogous to the transition from the political to the personal *parrhesia*. In the first meaning there is a presuppositional condition that the *parrhesiastes* is the subordinate person who "says everything" to the superordinate person. In the second meaning, it only seems that the "truth-speaker" is the sole authority, the one who motivates the other to self-criticism and thus to changing his practice. In fact, *parrhesia* takes place in this second meaning in the transition and exchange between the positions. *Parrhesia* is thus not a characteristic / competency / strategy of a single person, but rather a concatenation of positions within the framework of the relationship between the *parrhesiastes'* criticism and the self-criticism thereby evoked. (Raunig, 2004)

The examples given can become places of self-parrhesia by forming a collaborative web of relationships that would motivate self-criticism and changing of practice. What Raunig (2004) also writes in this relation is how the activistic, or in the terms of this thesis, the independent sector can be affected in the relation with institutions and vice versa, or when this relation can be productive, or not misused:

> A productive game emerges here in the relationship between activists and institution, which is neither limited to a cooptation of the political by the institution, nor to a simple redistribution of resources from the progressive art institution to the political actions. Recomposing social criticism and institutional criticism means merging political and personal *parrhesia*. It is only by linking the two *parrhesia* techniques that a one-sided instrumentalization can be avoided, that the institutional machine is saved from closing itself off, that the flow between movement and institution can be maintained. (Raunig, 2004)

In essence, what awaits the independent sector is forwarding the strategic approach in the creation of different platforms for sharing the common, exchanging positions, reflecting and self-reflecting, and generating new discourses and political actions that will be effectuated into a new model of an institution.

The examples I provide here are in the context of a transitional (in terms of transfer from a socialistic to a capitalistic, neoliberal system) society that still does not recognize new techniques of governing, oriented towards professional individuals and not the state apparatus. However, it is imperative to observe the larger environment and plan, and imagine the change.

Raunig (2004) analyses the transformation or development of the current society through the concept of governmentality. He observes that:

> the dismantling of welfare-state forms of intervention is accompanied by a restructuring of techniques of governing, which transfer the leadership capacity of state apparatuses and instances to the population, to "responsible", "prudent" and "rational" individuals. This development relates primarily to the self-government, self-discipline and self-technologies of individuals, yet it goes beyond this. A new area of the management of microsectors is crystallizing in the dissolution of the welfare state, an intermediate zone between government by the state and the (self-) government and voluntary self-control of individuals: seemingly autonomous facilities, NGOs, which are invoked with buzz words like "civil society" and "distant from the state" as an exterior to the state, but which function as "outsourced" state apparatuses at the same time. Many art institutions belong to this category as well. In the governmentality setting, it becomes theoretically impossible and strategically not very promising to construct a dichotomous opposition between movement and institution, because not only resistive individuals, but also progressive institutions and civil society NGOs operate on the same plane of governmentality. In a reflection on the relations between political art practices and progressive art institutions, it can be neither a matter of the abstract negation of existing and incipient institutions and micro-institutions, nor of an acclamation of "anti-institutional" free networks or autonomous art collectives as being outside the institution. (Raunig, 2004)

Agreeing with Raunig (2004), who is also proposing a “relationship of political movement and institutions, of constituent and constituted power, of instituting and institutionalization“, I practically see the new strategies in the creation of co-governing new models of institutions that would enable a shift of the positions and redistribution of power. However, in the situation specific of transitional society of Macedonia, we need to analyse the basis for such

relationship, if possible as strategies to be implemented or, if they remain as theoretical models, conceptualised and researched to be realised in the future.

5.4 New strategic approaches – Legacy converted into new approaches and strategic alliances – networking and co-governing models (case studies and analyses)

In the post 2010 period, especially with the new developed National Strategy for Cultural Development 2013-2017, we could observe the forming of a new model of cultural policies in Macedonia. Depicting the model in order to situate the independent cultural scene within the system will provide a possibility to understand if the previously mentioned govermentality setting, where we can see the transfer of „leadership capacity of state apparatuses and instances to the population, to "responsible", "prudent" and "rational" individuals“, is possible. Such policy prioritization does not allow the development of a relationship of the independent scene and the institutions, of constituent and constituted power, of instituting and institutionalization, in Raunig’s words.

The role of the state is defined as stimulating, enhancing, and promoting the cultural relations in society, or integrating the culture in function of social development.

The support of the traditional arts and cultural heritage, and on the other hand, the creation of a social environment that will enable the implementation of new technologies in the field of art and culture, as well as fostering the development of creative industries, cultural management and marketing, and private initiatives, are mentioned as priorities. Culture is defined as a wide range of actions.

In this context, the strategy defines the national interest of the state in a wide range of culture, such as artistic creation, cultural heritage, and complementary areas (science and education, management and marketing, creative industries, new technologies and media production, distribution and reception of culture, alternative cultural expressions, cultural tourism, digitization of cultural heritage and contemporary creativity, intermediate and multimedia creative practices and international cultural policy). The representative elements that the strategy focuses on are the cultural diversity and pluralism existing in the country as values of wider cultural significance. In this context, the strategy aims to "encourage top and elite artistic creation and the system of top cultural values, but also to provide conditions for mass distribution and reception of cultural and artistic value." The strategy also mentions the following as priorities: (a) cultural rights and equal opportunities for access to culture; (B) freedom of artistic expression; and, (c) the autonomy of expression of creators that enhance creativity and intercultural dialogue, and social development as prerequisites for progress. Furthermore, it is underlined that the public and private cultural, traditional, and alternative scene should not only be equalized, but it should also be constantly encouraged in achieving the strategic interests of the country, or their rapprochement, on which they base the strategy.

The alternative, or independent cultural sector is nominated in the strategy as an important factor in the creation and adoption of new artistic values, methodologies, and practices, as well as a sustainable and visible influential social segment that actively participates in the socio-cultural processes. The initiatives of the independent cultural sector are also seen as effective promoters of contemporary culture in the country and abroad and potential communication channels with new audiences. The listed factors are seen as potentials. Therefore, the Ministry of Culture has committed to increasing the budget for supporting the projects conveying innovation and diversity in the cultural sphere, having multimedia and interdisciplinary approach, as well as diversified funding. The Ministry of Culture stands for

the development of a specific instrument for support of the independent sector. That is, providing a space and proper conditions for the production and presentation of contemporary cultural and artistic programs of the independent cultural sector, as an important instrument for promoting cooperation between the public and the independent cultural sectors. Details will be further determined through a dialogue between the Ministry of Culture and the independent cultural sector as declared in the strategy. The development of mutual dialogue will affect the resolution of all outstanding issues which are not sufficiently elaborated and defined in the broader social context, as mentioned in the part of the strategy dedicated to the independent sector.

In analysing this document, it can be seen that the de-metropolization, decentralization of culture, de-etatization and de-concentration of governance in culture, support of public – private collaboration are characteristics of strategy operation.

As proposed in this document, the new model of policy proposed by the authorities, or model of Cultural Functionalism (Dragićević Šešić and Dragojević, 2005, p.9) which incorporates the cultural management as method of cultural policy operation (especially seen as a priority area to be developed) is evident. This model supports the concept of inter-sector collaboration where key agents are seen as all the actors in the three sectors: public, private, and civil, and where the characteristics mentioned above are analogue to this model: inventiveness, dynamism, and participation.

However, the situation analyses are depicting another reality. First, the cultural management method for institutional or cultural development is not applied. It can still be witnessed that there is no educational program, or any other instrument that would imply the significant change, or any step forward towards the method application.

There is very little and insignificant communication among the three sectors, or more precisely, there is no communication among the public and the civil sector, and private –

public relations are based on sponsorship relations (not many). The equal treatment of the sectors, as stated, cannot be witnessed since none of the proposed instruments were implemented, nor there is a transparent budget distribution from where one can analyse the percentage in the budget increasing, or the equality in the budget distribution.

In reality, the model functions more as a merger or cultural mercantilism model (commodification of products and information, creation of trends, mass culture, cultural hybridisation) and Cultural diffusionism (representativeness, excellence, systematic approach, traditionalism), where key agents are cultural institutions at all levels, and the concept of policy orientation is the production of elite culture and program of decentralisation. In such inconsistency, one can see that two key agents are prioritised: *state institutions and the private sector*, or entities producing mass culture, or mainstream culture. The independent sector in culture is marginalized, not supported or supported with no significant funds[55].

We have been witnessing the exhausted funds for culture on national level, closed and distanced public institutions oriented towards the creation of the new semiotical map of the national cultural identity. International foundations have been withdrawing from the country

[55] In 2014, the International festival for contemporary dance and performance LocoMotion did not get any support for its 7th edition. For its 8th edition, it got a support of 1000 Euros. We need to have in mind that this festival is the only one of such kind in the country. Also, the project Life Long Burning, supported on high level ranging of EU culture program 2007-2013, did not get any support by the Ministry of Culture in 2015, regardless of the fact that the Ministry also stated that it will support all projects supported by the EU Program of Culture, later developed in Creative Culture. Both projects are run by NGO Lokomotiva, which was formed in 2003, and is one of the main actors in the independent cultural scene in Macedonia, a recognized actor in the region of ex-Yugoslavia, as well as internationally. This example is given only for the purposes of depicting the implicit realization and implementation of the strategy. This is not a single example, but one that can be representative of the independent sector's (the one taken in consideration for the analyses in this thesis) treatment by the state.

in which the civil sector has been employing tactics of survival. However, using the lessons learned from the past into new strategies of collaborative alliances.

Strategies of *collaborative alliances* are connected with the recreation of disappeared space(s) into forms of gathering such *as associations, or collectives, informal groups, and other* (through redistribution of the activities into many spaces (something that has already been done by some organizations mentioned above, but not as alliances), by using the existing spaces such as restaurants, homes, streets, 'mesni zaednici' (community centres from the ex-Yugoslavia period), national cultural institutions, festivals, as well as forming new allied spaces, and so on).

Collaborative alliances were seen as a possibility to share the resources and capitals, bringing forward the idea of common affront of individual as approach that would enable better visibility, strengthen the forces and give a voice. All alliances are built on the idea of common, solidarity, equality, distribution of power, even though they might employ different systems of governing, or organizing.

However, there are different objectives in the mentioned *strategies for collaborative alliances*. Yet, all of them are sharing the aspect of self-management, or development of methods, procedures, and skills by which these collectives are directing their activities towards achievement of certain goals.

Thus, to depict these alliances or attempts to build a critical sphere in which contemporary arts or socio cultural content can be articulated, I would place them into two categories and try to explicate how these initiatives work, and if there is a potent to be articulated into new organizational and institutional models.

a) <u>First approach- new communities solidifying around the space (s) reformation</u>

There have been new actions articulated towards the space creation where a certain community would be enacted. It can be seen as a ‘performing re-enactment’ of the previously mentioned cases. However, the approach is transformed - from one NGO initiative to a certain collective or self-generated community initiative.

One example is AKSC or – Autonomous cultural social centre –describing themselves as: a new free zone for the art, activism, or creative centre for “artivism”. In the last year of their existence, they announced that they have organized more than 50 events: exhibitions, film projections, discussions, meetings of civil initiatives, leftists organizations, eco groups, free consultation about legislative matters, poetry readings, library, and other. Or, as Ana Todorovska, one of its members, explains: *The centre was officially opened in November 2013. It rose as a form of protest against the suffocating society and oppressive political system. That’s why we call it a free zone and a form of creative resistance that puts alternative ideas into action and gives home to artistic expression, critical thinking, debating, and socially-engaged activities”.* Or, as Ana Jovkovska, another member, adds*: “to be a gravitational core of open-minded people, progressive ideas, and critical thinking in Skopje”.* AKSC is not a formally registered organization. They present themselves as a collective of 15-20 people who would like to offer another or an alternative way of functioning and living. They see as their strongest trait the one that demonstrates how the horizontal structure functions, where every voice is heard before the final decision, which is a result of consensus. Their values are expressed as: "Centre that promotes friendship, nonviolence, equality, solidarity, exchange, and will not support and will oppose the nationalism, militarism, capitalism, imperialism. It is from the people for the people”. They function horizontally and on voluntary basis, from donations by individuals, or the space functions against classical

models of funding - without foundations and grants, but on the principle of voluntary donations from citizens and self-sustainability.

They refer to the model as pioneer for Macedonia, and that examples of the same model have been used in Bulgaria and Greece. What differentiates them from the other similar organizations in the region, as they articulate, is the rereading of the needs of the cultural context in particular, and addressing those needs through the creation of an open space in which they can be articulated.

They have been building the organizational attitude and positioning themselves as an activistic organization that opposes the "political activism": "We live in society that celebrates and prefers conformity, and public space for alternative ideas, art, and political thought is more limited. In the last few years, we are witnessing a new scene of activism, or the so-called "grass roots" activism, on the other side of political activism, which is very popular in our society, unfortunately. This new type of activism is working with the ideas and politics that directly concern the citizen and are less interested in the political players that are conducting the politics".

They also say that they are functioning without authorities and hierarchy on horizontal bases, according to the principles of equality, direct democracy, trust, solidarity, and mutual help.

The question is – do these statements position them as such, or it is a process in which this can be learned and built? Do we make the position just by acclaiming it, or is it a position that needs continuous questioning, reformation, negotiations, self-reflection, and certain verticalization (matrix structure)?

In the independent cultural strata this is a new attempt to articulate the ideology into practice, or to witness if and how these processes can endure in the neoliberal environment. Thus, to witness if these processes of self-organization, self-education, governing through horizontality, economy based on exchange and volunteering, as well as solidarity based

donations can use the potentiality to be adapted to the context in which this collective wants to withhold them. We can challenge this process through the prism of Giep Hagoort (2003), proposing the management theory that “structure follows strategy”. We can also note that two proposed principles of structure of cultural organisation: division of labour and coordination of the activities, have to be more precisely thought. The first principle is who in the organization develops the production activities, and the second is where the responsibilities lie in relation to fulfilling the strategic goals (Hagoort, 2003, p.134). These principles as basics are proposed in order to develop the effectiveness. We can understand it not only through the prism of market effectiveness, but also in relation to quality realisation of the activities. If there is no structure that supports the division of task as an approach that will enable clear understanding of where the responsibility lies, we can witness stagnation in the Go-Go phase (frantic energetic early growth and sometimes chaos) in terms of Adizes.

While this research took place, AKSC stopped existing.

Another example in this direction is the initiative KOOPERACIJA, which stands for shifting and redefining the borders between public and personal space. Its basic strategy was the occupation of temporarily free space dispersed throughout the urban landscape, and exhibiting via a chain of *blitzkrieg* events. The desired effect is a constructive dialogue regarding the re-questioning of the critical positions in art and producing a favourable environment for free exchange of ideas, experience, and freedom of expression.

It is an initiative whose purpose is artistic activity outside the inert institutional frameworks. Thus, it is suggesting a distinctive approach to the creation and experience of contemporary art. Its objective is to initiate questions concerning the dynamic role of art in the context of

centralized cultural politics and social discourse, striving to encourage the interaction between the artist and the audience.[56]

The activities of Kooperacija provoked a debate of its action from artistic to cultural. Nebojša Vilić, art critic and professor, writes about its impact especially in relation to the questions it addresses, and the argumentation in posing these questions. However, he points out that they remain unanswered. He underlines:

> This derogation from the standardized contemporary museum - gallery principles would position the art work in the situation of uncertain interpretation, misbalanced situation and consequently distortion in the relation artist - audience. Finally, such unstable configuration can be interpreted as a certain reflection of the socio – political situation in which we exist. (Vilić, 2013, p.13).

He believs that repetition of the actions, procedures, and strategies in the socio-political context of Kooperativa, only re-repeat the same socio-political conditions in the field, not only the artistic, but also, and above all, those in the field of cultural. Their actions of posing the questions are not only related to the artistic as a creation, but moreover, the artistic as a practice, strategies, and politics, which exits from the artistic and enters in the cultural (Vilić, 2013).

Such actions affected the cultural sphere. However, I am not commenting the artistic or esthetical impact that they had, but the cultural impact. More specifically, I am commenting the strategies for horizontal development of the space(s) for self-parreshia that would produce a constructive dialogue regarding the "re-questioning of the critical positions in art and producing a favourable environment for a free exchange of ideas, experience and freedom of expression."

Kooperacija also stopped to exist as an initiative or a collective action.

[56] http://www.izlez.mk/?p=18772

These examples provide an overview of the actions that have been taken without a planned set of tactics, or more precisely, strategies on how to affect the cultural field. They had a general idea or a goal, but no set of actions or methods that would intervene directly in the sphere. The development of a certain methodology that would address the goals approached, or a certain plan for impact is necessary besides the ideological orientation, or the general goal to produce an environment that would support free exchange of ideas, experience, and freedom of expression. Also, a definition of the system of governing, decision-making followed by clear procedures would enhance the sustainability.

b) Second approach – New community solidifying around common goals through establishment of formal associations, with new models of governing, clear structure, and developed strategies

Association – JADRO is the first association of independent cultural organizations and individuals in culture in Macedonia. This formalised structure is a consequence of informal negotiation processes preceding the years of its formation. An initiative known as NKS (Nezavisna Kulturna Scena / Independent Cultural Scene) preceded JADRO, or existed for few years before JADRO was formed. NKS was an informal group of associations in culture which were the voice for several initiatives in the field, among which the development of a strategy for civil society on a local level. NKS was transformed in the association JADRO, and was formally registered under the Law on civil society organizations in 2012. The association gathered around 50 organizations, informal groups, and individuals.

JADRO defines itself as non-profit, inclusive, participatory and advocacy platform that aims to strengthen the independent cultural sector and its impact on policy and practice of cultural policies in order to encourage democratization processes in culture and beyond, in society and the civic sector.

The main activities of this platform, which incorporates organizations, individuals, and informal groups, are aimed at providing a broader visibility and social relevance of the independent cultural sector through continuous representation of program activities, advocacy for sustainable development of the sector, strengthening its influence in the socio-cultural context, the development of alternative cultural practices at national, local, and regional level.

Since its establishment in 2012, JADRO – Association of the independent culture scene, has realized several projects and activities, which according to its mission are related to advocacy activities and capacity building of the independent cultural sector and the wider civil society. The priorities of intervention that were detected include the creation of a new model of institution for the independent cultural sector, and the creation of a specific body for the independent scene within the Ministry of Culture as a referent point for further policy negotiations.

The projects and activities that this association has implemented in the past years are directed towards the detected priority field of intervention.

The project “Up Turn” (2011 – 2012), was the first project of the association aimed at strengthening the visibility of the independent cultural sector, the presentation of the sector and its needs in the wider socio-cultural context, as well as raising awareness of the policy relevance of this sector. The second project "The missing courtyard”, was an advocacy project directly addressing one of the priorities advocated by the association, which is the creation of a model of institution for the independent cultural sector. This project preceded the formal negotiations and advocacy of JADRO with the Centre municipality for the establishment of a new model of institution based on public-civil partnership. As part of this process, JADRO also consolidated its membership through strategic planning, which

stipulates that one of the principal goals is the establishment of such an institution. In 2015, JADRO organized the first public discussion through which the public was introduced with the principles of this institutional model, which will be further on developed and disseminated.

After the change of government in 2017, JADRO was a partner of the Ministry of Culture in the implementation of the debates related to the creation of the new strategic cultural plan 2018-2022.

In the socio-cultural context, JADRO has been established not only as an advocacy platform for its own interests, but also for the interests of the wider context in the field of culture and cultural policies. With this goal, JADRO publicly proclaimed dozen announcements and events.

JADRO is formed on the lessons learned from the past, reforming the position of negotiation from single to multiple voices in order to become a relevant and a pro-active participant in the socio-cultural processes stimulating culture as an ongoing process of dynamic, heterogeneous ideas, identities, and forms of artistic expression. This enables the association to obtain legitimacy and to strengthen its position towards any external factors, or "The more cultural producers form a closed field of competition for cultural legitimacy, the more the internal demarcations appear irreducible to any external factors of economic, political or social differentiation" (Bourdieu, 1984, p.5).

In the politically most fragile moment since the Macedonian independence, this association intends to be vigilant in the effort to clearly and boldly point out the necessity of critical thinking in relation to the socio-cultural context, as well as the necessity for de-monopolization of culture and art, whose fate depends on a small number of people who hold the decision-making power.

The association incorporates the values and principles that were mentioned by single organizations, creating a space of adjoin of free, responsible, and critical thinking, and proactive, tactically and strategically planed actions in the public sphere.

One of the most important projects or priorities mentioned is the creation of a model for the independent cultural sector. This is a participative model of governing, or a hybridized model of public – civil partnership, or the SCS Centre-JADRO. This is still an ongoing process where representatives negotiate with the municipality of Centre for the formation of the institutional model.

Or, as Iskra Geshoska, ex-president and now part of the decision-making body, and Yane Calovski, ex-deputy president and now president of the association JADRO, would underline about the model:

> As this model is based on a partnership between the local government and the civil society, made up of organizations, individuals and informal groups, the management will lead to the preamble of a democratic governance model. With this model, there is a substantial decentralization of power and the limited capacity for the practices of political party influence. It is the only way to create organizational and program autonomy in the activities in the sphere of culture within the civil sector but also wider. Through this format, basic resource and institutional stability is ensured, as well as participation in management. This model ensures long-term sustainability, resulting from public infrastructure support on the one hand, and independent programming and participatory decision making on the other. (Geshoska and Chalovski, 2018, pp. 96-97)

Another example is the initiative KINO KULTURA, a project of alliance between communities represented through two initiators aiming to develop a new model of governing solidified around a space.

KINO KULTURA, as a project space for contemporary performing arts and culture in 2015, was founded by Theatre Navigator Cvetko and Lokomotiva- Centre for New Initiatives in Arts and Culture.

In the past, this space was known as cinema KULTURA, a significant cultural space and monument of the Macedonian culture. This space will be presented in the Appendix of this thesis, as a case study of a methodological approach of development of new governmental model for contemporary performing arts and culture. It is a model - a production of sociality through art content.

KINO KULTURA is developing a model where voices can also be multiplied, having a different methodological approach from SCS Centar-JADRO. However, it still enables the reforming of the working conditions for actors in the sphere of contemporary performing arts. These two approaches are diverse in aims and program structure, and are thus not comparable through these parameters. Here, they are presented as the latest examples of alliances consolidating around the public space.

The project KINO KULTURA aims at establishing a new contemporary organizational structure that will support the work and sustainability of a space for performing arts, which will include other socially relevant activities and related fields. This space aims to be inclusive and intended both for professionals and immediate citizens of the municipality and the city, as well as for various communities as part of the socio-cultural sphere.

These two organizations, the initiators Theatre Navigator Cvetko and Lokomotiva, were mapping various spaces in Skopje that can be reformed in a space for contemporary performing arts and culture, since such a space did not exist.

The idea behind them is the formation of a new model of co-governing and "recycled economy", meaning that together with the other 'users' they will redistribute the gained profit into the programs' development and space maintenance. More information about this approach, which is still an ongoing process, is provided in the Appendix on the case study of Kino Kultura, Project Space for Contemporary Performing Arts and Contemporary Culture.

Alliances, as strategies or a methodological approach, constructed a situation of laboratory in which certain cultural practices can be tested in a broader social context, or in the context that is the public sphere. The reformation of the public sphere and democratisation of the public space can allow changes in the cultural sphere. In other words, changes in cultural sphere are possible only if reformation is carried out in a larger public sphere.

In order to understand the above described strategies, approaches and attempts of changes of the public sphere through public spaces, I will extract some general lines about the context, or the general policies related to the creation and development of the independent cultural sector in Macedonia.

Table 1: General characteristics of the public policies and the independent cultural sector

90s creation	Post 2000	Post 2007
Policy: Transitional model, not determined cultural policy, strong centralisation, unclear responsibilities, obsolete schemes of bureaucratics, institutional financing, creation of top-down civil society.	Policy: Ohrid Framework Agreement model (See Simjanovska, 2013)[57] no steps forward from the previous experience, the trend of making ad hoc decisions without any serious analysis and research, implementing party affiliations and interests, Implicit bottom-up civil initiatives influenced by top - down diverse foundation policies, not supported by the national policies of the state, CSO corrector and supervisor of the democratic processes.	Policy: Skopje 2014 (See Simjanovska, 2013) Identity policies supported by capital investments, not open for citizen participation in decision-making, cultural policy demonstrating the manipulation of cultural values, memories of the citizens creating new national mono-ethnic identity. Creation of National Strategy for cultural development 2013-2017, creation of an explicit policy, not implemented

[57] See more about the Ohrid Framework Agreement and its influence on the remodelling of the policy of culture in: Violeta Simjanovska, Possible New Model of Cultural Policy of the Republic of Macedonia In Multicultural Context, Phd Thesis 133-138 p. (courtesy of the author).

		as planned. CSO - Disempowered due to financial reasons- withdrawal of international foundations. Creation of CSOs as extended hands of government.
Creation of organization models – vertical, still inclusive. Creation of few, but influential NGOs. Creation of pseudo – institutions with fixed political agenda.	Creation of grass – root initiatives followed by enthusiasm, motivation for change, collaboration and creation of larger communities.	Closure of many organizations from the past, de-professionalization of the sector (many are employed in other or cultural industry sectors), or change of agendas – programs of many strategies and of survival (new programming, regrouping, associative programming on EU projects…). Top –down foundation policies of activist approach.
Capacity building of	Capacity building of new	Capacity building in

professionals within the organizations and related to the organizations.	professionals, organizations, and larger communities (programs from the organizations for the communities, multiplied).	networking, collaborating and advocacy. Implicit need for activistic approaches as tactics.
Side effects: gate keepers and hegemony over contemporary culture, bureaucratisation of culture, no sustainable program agendas after financial cuts of dominant foundations.	Side effects: Project oriented spaces, large missions not sustained due to political turmoil.	Side effects: Creation of pseudo - activist, artivist approaches, pseudo-artistic missions.
Positive: development of new skills, international liaisons, inclusion of professionals into processes.	Positive: new communities gathered around certain organizations, spaces; lessons learned; build capacities in strategic development of organizations, fundraising.	Positive: New alliances, collaborative platforms, new approaches of organizing, creation of culture of excesses.

6. Artist driven cultural policies vs top-down policies

This Chapter provides an overview of the policy impacts on the field of contemporary performing arts, and the interrelation between EU and national policies. Furthermore, it considers the arguments of the need of the artistic driven cultural policies, or the advocacy actions aiming to enhance the policy changes in the region of ex-Yugoslavia, the institutional paradigm and the working conditions in the cultural field. The Chapter also includes the proposals of the new approaches, or methods that forward the development of the post managerial paradigm and post-institution. The method of forming the post-institution is through participative governance, and rhizomatic governance (organizational) with shared leadership. It is related to the policy making approach of *shared policies*. In addition, the legal format of public private partnership is overviewed.

6.1 General overview of the EU and ex-Yugoslavia policies in dance and performance

In the context of ex-Yugoslavia, unfortunate policy decisions related to contemporary dance can be witnessed. One briefly mentioned is the situation with the city of Zagreb, where the Zagreb Dance Centre was redirected to the theatre institution governance by which the autonomy of the dance field has somehow been abridged (Ožegović, 2017). There is an absence of administrators driven cultural policy, or lack of knowledge about the needs in the contemporary dance and performance filed.

Therefore, on different occasions and forms of meetings or events, artists, producers, theorists, curators, managers, dramaturges, and other professionals have been meeting and proposing what policies should be reformed, in order to assist the needs of the artists and the

scene. These initiatives concern issues related to the working conditions, workers' rights, instruments and mechanisms for art production and dissemination, institutions, and so on.

The unfortunate understanding of dance by the administration, as well as the wider audience, in its very narrow meaning, speaks about a very politically immature context, but also about an education system as well as a culture that does not address the art development, and remains on the traditional understanding of the field. The general atmosphere is that there is no sensitivity to contemporary art needs and also aesthetics.

Jean Monnet, the creator of the European Union, looking back at the history of the European integration said: "If we were to do it all again, we would start with culture". This is taken as a leading direction for many politicians and decision makers related to the EU politics, but still agreeing on the declarative level that culture should play a greater role in the EU. However, there are various opinions on the European Cultural policy subject, mainly because of the difference in the reading of the term culture that varies in different contexts.

There are numerous evidence of this. The last was the change of the Minister of Culture in Macedonia, who came with professional background in culture, with a Minister of Culture with background in civil engineering. This was a political exchange needed among the parties in coalition, and the Ministry of Culture was the one to be traded.

I have previously brought up the subject of translating, interpreting, and understanding. However, I would like to add that it is also part of the ideological realm and it is politically driven. Today, decision-making processes and processes of the creation of the policies are locally driven, or created to address the specifics in a certain context, since not all of them can be equally approached on a national level. National policies models can enable such approaches, for instance, territorially driven policies encompassing diverse cultural specifics in a certain territory of the space, rather than ethnic specific, for example. I will talk more about this later in this subchapter.

There is also a basic division on market driven or state (political party) driven and artistic driven policies. These levels rarely meet, and are often misused. Mostly in the market or party favour, and rarely to the artistic field.

EU policies, whether existing on paper or not, are explicitly pushing culture on the market, and it is also a market driven cultural policy that would inevitably result in decaying of the public space of culture and art in the long-run.

Some authors, whose opinion is that the primary role of culture is the public one, believe that such policy does not exist, while others believe that such role is implicitly formulated and supported. There are opinions that an explicit cultural policy is needed. However, some consider that it does exist even though it is not formulated. It is addressed under the Article 151 of the Amsterdam Treaty and the Programs on Culture (previously Cultural Program 2007-2013, and now Creative Europe). The topic of culture and cultural policy circulates through the European Union agenda. Still, most of the member states respect the principle of "subsidiarity" (on national and EU level) and reject the idea of common cultural policy.

Or, as Violeta Simjanovska (2013) addresses Gottfried Wagner in her PhD work: What we

> have are 'cultural policies by default'. And herein lays one of the problems: to have no cultural policy is a cultural policy too, but an implicit one, driven by other actors, that is, the market. Europe struggles to build a trans-national community based on respect for and a cosmopolitan outlook on diversity, and has no means or strategy for its 'software'. (Simjanovska, 2013, p.77)

Simjanovska (2013, p.77) is arguing that the changes of the European reality in the last decades, impacted the economic, social, territorial terms, as well as the culture, which created a changed relation between territorial unit and people in Europe. For such changes, new concepts, models, instruments, measures and tools should be re-thought and created, adopted

and implemented, in order to answer the needs of the new circumstances created in the last years (Simjanovska, 2013, p.77).

We cannot analyse any EU policy paper that directly addresses the performing arts, but we can have an overview of different state policies and different systems in which performing arts are organized and are communicating in the frameworks of the EU. The Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe gives valuable information where information is updated, covering national cultural policies in forty one countries.[58]

Funding in most of the European countries is organized as a subsidiary system, a public funding on national level through national bodies such as the Ministry of Culture (in some cases including sport, media, and other), or Art Councils, and on local level, through the city or the municipalities' funds for culture.

In the article *Performing Arts Policies and Funding in Europe* (Staines, 2009)[59], analyses on the funding mechanisms in Europe are given. Most of the countries in the Western Balkans, or Central and Eastern Europe, as well as Spain, Italy, France, Austria, and Sweden, are financed throughout the national bodies by specific departments for performing arts, or stage arts. The Nordic Countries such as Finland, Denmark, and Norway, as well as the United Kingdom and Ireland are financed through the national body Art Council conceived as an "arm's length" body, which circulates the decision makers in 2-4 years, having independence in decision-making and program creating (priorities, fields, and other). The United Kingdom has Arts Councils for England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. Germany operates through sixteen federal states (Länder), having their own programs for culture development,

[58] Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe www.culturalpolicies.net - See more at: http://culture360.asef.org/publications/performing-arts-policy-and-funding-in-europe/#sthash.T1CgeqvM.dpuf

[59] The article was commissioned by the Saison Foundation in Japan for publication in its Viewpoints newsletter 48.

as well as policies and mechanisms. Belgium and Switzerland have territorial and linguistic communities. In Belgium, there are separate structures of support, as well as organizing culture in Flemish, French, and the smaller German speaking community. Another level of subsidiaries can be found on the local level, as I mentioned, and in many cities around Europe the major contributors are the local authorities whose politics are varying, as well as the instruments of support and the policy mechanisms.

Central governments are supporting the national institutions and, to a smaller extent, other performing initiatives, while the cities invest in the new or independent sector and artists. However, they can be, or are in some states, big supporters and facilitators of the policy process that enables the development of art (Germany, Belgium, France, as with specific plans such as TanzPlan in Germany, researches and recommendations from the Flanders Art Institute, formerly Vlaams Theater Instituut, French choreographic centres as decentralised dance spaces, and other).

The authors Cas Smithuijsen and Joris Vermeulen describe "diminishing dualism" in their book *State on Stage*, mentioned in the same article concerning performing arts policies and funding resources in Europe (Staines, 2009),[60] where they are identifying some interesting trends which have emerged in Europe since the early 1990s. They make a distinction between the performing arts organization and financing in, as they say - the "post-communist" countries of Central and Eastern Europe and Western Europe. In Central and Eastern Europe, the funding policies were towards large repertoire theatres where the independent sector is marginalized or very little supported. In Western Europe the situation differs since various institutions and initiatives are supported, from national venues to companies, production houses, and residential spaces to the small, experimental, and independent sector. An

[60] Performing Arts policies and funding in Europe, article was commissioned by the Saison Foundation in Japan for publication in its Viewpoints newsletter 48.

illustration of this is the clear and transparent policy in such direction that can be found in Western Europe, which depicts the political orientation (Krupp, 2015).[61]

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, changes have been implemented, and more states from the ex- communist bloc and some from ex- Yugoslavia, have been integrated in the European Union. This indicated and produced certain policy transformations or a break of the homogeneous, even though diverse in outcome, contributing to the dissolving of the differences between the systems. However, such diversities brought some other common denominators that enabled these huge differences to dissolve.

In the post-communist and post-Yugoslavian countries, political systems have changed from one party to multiparty systems, and societies have gone through transformations of the public goods, privatisation of industrial as well as other resources, creating the possibilities for a free market, or enabling the capitalistic reforms. Reforms have changed the environment in which culture is being developed. Consequently, they have impacted the restructuring of the instruments and mechanisms in the field, which are today available to the independent sector. The percentage and the way in which funds are distributed is still part of the dialogue or the advocating issues that the independent sector addresses, differentiating from one country to another.

Political reforms on European level have also influenced national policies in culture, especially in the frame of the commercialisation of the sector, as well as the development of the private funds, or sponsorship culture, which are rarely seen as an ongoing practice, but rather rare examples. Reforms are going very slowly, and are therefore still unequal to be compared to Western Europe, especially in the decentralisation of the decision asking system which is still highly centralised and run by clientelism and party in power driven politics.

[61] Policy of the city of Berlin to increase the funds for independent art sector for 22 million that would be 489 million for 2016, and 508 millions in 2017.

6.2 Advocacy on regional level and dance policy in Macedonia

Since the 2000s, different collaborative actions have started in ex-Yugoslavia. Some are still being active, addressing the continual political, economic, and social crises through collaborative projects, platforms, and networks. One of the examples, related to dance, is Nomad Dance Academy Platform that contributed to different context development[62] by exchanging the expertise, generating new knowledge, forming self-reflection processes, and creating formats for distribution (the festivals LocoMotion in Skopje, Kondenz in Belgrade, Antistatic in Sofia, Cofestival in Ljubljana) in the field of contemporary dance.

> Starting from its first conceptual framework, set in 2006, the Nomad Dance Academy has grown into a platform and a collaborative network; moreover, it is now a self-organised system and format, which has affected different areas of collaboration, exchange, mutual support, capacity building, and cultural policy.
>
> The post-2000 Balkans cultural context, in which the Nomad Dance Academy appeared, may be described as post-transitional and 'nation-building'-oriented, which has resurrected old mechanisms of governance in culture, supporting and emphasising the traditional values that are supposed to help the new nation states shape their national(istic) identities (See Dragićević Šešić and Şuteu, 2005; Dragićević Šešić and Dragojević, 2006).
>
> Such officially proclaimed goals oriented most of the Balkan states' national cultural policies towards investing into the past, i.e., into the heritage of the majority population, in order to find or reinvent their national roots. In this context, live and contemporary culture found itself in a void – as an excess without any support from

[62] Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Slovenija and Serbia.

the system that could secure its existence and further development. (Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski and Cvetković Marković, 2011, pp. 26-39)

Acting in such socio-political and cultural context, the NDA tried to fluctuate between a post-transitional system that had already adopted all the main neoliberal capitalist concepts whereby culture and art are seen primarily as commodities, and in which socio-cultural capital is produced with new values, or is used for nationalistic manipulations.

Acting within a system that would not recognise such an initiative as part of it has infused many with a feeling of not-belonging, which led to the creation of a 'new system' within the system, a different format that would enable the re-production of the notions of culture and its values. Or, some initiatives, such as the NDA, tried to modify the rules of the 'infinite' game (Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski and Cvetković Marković, 2011, p.28)[63], and create a space where no national cultural policy or national agenda could direct or limit the production of new values. On the other hand, these initiatives have been aware of the new international (that is, the EU's and international donors') agendas for the Balkans and their insistence on, and support for, regional cooperation.

The Slovenian cultural policy expert Vesna Čopič has challenged such policy-making by claiming that the key for a successful inner reconstruction of South-Eastern Europe is 'a strong state and a strong civil society' model. This means supporting the independent sector, or projects such as the Nomad Dance Academy, as a 'Space of Appearance', within which a form of political action takes place that is not just ephemeral and based on speech as action,

[63] This is in relation to play as a category of thought. 'game' here as an infinite game (cultures are infinite games), an open-ended play that sustains existence. The division of 'finite' and 'infinite' games. James P. Carse, quoted in Schechner, R., 2002. *Performance Studies, An Introduction*. London: Routledge. pp.87–88.

but instead firmly rests on 'acting without a model' and on making 'its means as visible as possible' (Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski and Cvetković Marković, 2011, p. 37).[64]

However, such initiatives cannot have larger effects in the creation of the strong civil society if they remain as parallel creations, being affected by law and financial regulations, by social reforms and policy measures. These conditions do affect their actions, they regulate the space and the participation which cannot exist in the long-run without financial support and other mechanisms.

Therefore, questions such as *what constitutes dance*, how we can work together and what are the working conditions that we need, are among the ones to be immediately answered in relation to the methodology or approach that is needed to support the development of the dance scene.

Politics are requiring or desiring new professional qualifications which will be oriented towards the economization of culture, which is regulated in different states by different laws or strategic documents signifying the needed outcomes.

The Law that regulates a specific free-lance work of artists, producers or other cultural workers (not all professions included) is the Law on Culture and labour laws for the artists. In the present law state in Macedonia, certain demands or criteria are formatted in relation to a number of exhibitions, performances, films (national, local, international, and so on), which is still formatted over the indicators from the past. One can get a status of a freelance artist if

[64] In 'WE: Collectivities, Mutualities, Participations' Irit Rogoff (2006) uses Hannah Arendt's 'space of appearance' to suggest the meaning of exhibition, and further on she states: 'If we can accept the space of the exhibition as the arena for such enactments, in which it is we the audience who produce the meanings through our "being" and our acknowledgement of mutualities and imbrications – *then what we have is the possibility of another political space*. Instead of an occasion for the translation of various sets of politics into the realm of aesthetics and language, instead of a series of exercises in moral navigations that take place in and through the art exhibition, we have the possibility of an actual political space tout court'.

addressing the logic of quantified indicators. However, not many artists are able to fulfil it due to a lack of production facilities and supporting instruments.

Moreover, the production facilities and supporting instruments for performers, choreographers, and dancers are almost non-existent, being more specific than in other field such as visual arts. The criteria[65] for the freelance dance artist status referred to as productive artist (free translation by the author) regulated through the Law on Culture were to have at least five choreographies performed by ballet or folklore ensemble, or for reproductive artists (free translation by the author), to have at least 5 solo ballet roles that are positively evaluated. Under such criteria, one can never become a freelance professional (choreographer, performer, dancer, producer, and other) in the field of contemporary dance. Moreover, it is not possible to achieve these criteria since there is only one ballet ensemble that does not have more than two premieres in a season, which are most likely choreographed by some international ballet choreographer, or in-house ballet dancers choreographing in the neoclassical dance aesthetics. In addition, dancers in the core de ballet are employed, or engaged on honorarium bases for a certain period, with the aim to be permanently employed. Therefore, there is almost no space for anyone to become a productive or reproductive (by the law description) performing arts artist in the field of dance. However, there are independent artists (not using freelance deliberately in order to distinguished the status) in the field of contemporary dance who are producing their works, which are not performed by the ensemble, but by themselves and other colleagues from the independent scene. Nevertheless, such a production process was already known with the dance expressionism in the first years of the 20th century when the main break–up in production process with the classical ballet was done. One of the key breaks that dance expressionism establishes in relation to white dance, changing its hierarchical logic of work, is that on the stage the choreographer is also a

[65] Criteria of the open call: http://kultura.gov.mk/index.php/konkursi/1638-konkurs-za-dodeluvanje-mesecni-nadomestoci-na-samostojnite-umetnici-za-2015-godina

dancer, an author who is at the same time a performer of own performing language and own body. Furthermore, the music and the costumes are chosen by the author (Cvejić et al., 2002, p.20). I give this example to illustrate the very little knowledge of the dance system of a production by one of the key factors – the decision makers, or the policy creators in a context that is not non-European, or isolated, but a system that creates policies by disregarding the existing ones.

With the initiative of the group of independent cultural workers, among which myself, as part of the project "Culture for civil changes"[66], with the political will of the Minister of Culture Robert Alagjozovski (june 2017 – june 2018), we have moved forward changes in this respect. However, we have changed only the criteria for some freelance authors, such as, in this case, dancers and choreographers.[67]

In the new Regulations, dance art and contemporary performing arts are added under Article 6, adapting criteria to address the production processes in the independent dance field which concerns dancers, performers, and choreographers.[68]

---

[66] Ivana Vaseva and I were researching the position of the artist and cultural worker in Macedonia through comparative analyses of the ex-Yugoslavia countries, namely Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia, and Bulgaria. We also made several workshops with the cultural workers from different sector in Macedonia and public workshop where we presented the results. Public workshop with theme "Workers rights in cultural sector- Position of cultural workers on the independent scene in Macedonia", realized in Mobile gallery, Skopje, 29.03.2016, from 11.00-17.30

This activity was realized in the frame of the project "Culture for civil changes" in organization of Faculty for things that can't be learned, supported by USAID and Foundation for Open Society, Macedonia. Partners were Lokomotiva, Skopje, Square Freedom, Skopje, Centre for contemporary arts, Skopje and Foundation for development of the local community, Shtip)

[67] REGULATIONS for support of the freelance artists in Macedonia, 2018, http://kultura.gov.mk/index.php/legislativa/2011-03-04-10-39-27/3326-2017-12-13-14-26-41, http://www.kultura.gov.mk/images/stories/Pravilnik_samostojni_umetnici_NOV_1.pdf

[68] DANCE ART AND CONTEMPORARY PERFORMING ARTS Article 6 The artist from the field of dance art should meet at least one of the following criteria: to have performed at least five author's works and/or to have performed at least five works from the dance art of other authors and other activities in the area of discursive practices, trainings, seminars, and workshops (performer – contemporary dance/performance), - to

To come back again to the previous policy paper or the previous *National Strategy for cultural development of R. Macedonia 2007-2017* [69] that has not been evaluated, we can witness that creation of opportunities to place culture on the market is considered, proposing evaluation of the artistic work through the market logic, as an indication of a successful artistic work or artist.

This is a tendency on an EU and global level, or the cultural field started losing its:

> symbolic-creative legitimacy character and gaining more producing – service-consuming roles in order to make culture profitable as possible. Cultural managers are, thus, facing several questions/dilemmas: Are we accepting that culture is nothing more but Entertainment industry or Experience industry?. (Dragićević Šešić and Drezgić, 2018, p.45)

In the new *National strategy for cultural development of R. Macedonia 2018 – 2022*[70] there is tendency towards "Experience industry", having in mind that the market in Macedonia does not have a sustainable potential in the creative sector.

Creating a policy balance and supporting the development sector with potential to be profitable is the desired direction of policies development in Macedonia.

Brutal orientation towards the market and appropriation of the model of creative industries can be devastating. Such policy marked by the previous strategy indicated its explicit desire and will to create a system that supports hyper production, without concern of the processes in which art is created, not being able to view the invisible work of the creation, connected

---

have performed at least five soloistic roles with a minimum of 10 different titles on stages in the Republic Macedonia and abroad (dancer – classical ballet), - to have created at least five different choreographic works in different forms that are performed (choreographer).

[69] National Strategy for cultural development of R. Macedonia 2013-2017, http://www.kultura.gov.mk/index.php/legislativa/60-2013-02-27-10-20-24/840-nacionalna-strategija-za-razvoj

[70] National Strategy for cultural development of R. Macedonia 2018-2022 http://www.kultura.gov.mk/index.php/legislativa/60-2013-02-27-10-20-24/3949-nacionalona-strategija-za-razvoj-na-kulturata-vo-republika-makedonija-vo-periodot-2018-2022

with the issue of time, space, and conditions that are dictating it. It includes only the product as an outcome, and does not relate the process to other capitals such as social or cultural, as those created through the process. Or, the author's work is shaped by the financial policies, in relation to the length of the process, involvement of performers, as well as other elements of the work. The author work is not the final product, but the entire process in which many elements are incorporated, from research, collaborators, and other elements embodied into the final element – the performance.

Such a political approach diminishes the possibilities for development, and pushes forward growth as an indicator that can rarely be fulfilled, or can be fulfilled by already established, highly subsidized, visible, recognized institutions and artists, putting the emerging ones further on the margins. In the long-term, this policy will devastate the potentiality which lies in the processes of creation, as an asset from which new experiments, artistic language, and ideas can be formed.

Such policies deeply penetrated after 10 years in every pore of the cultural field in Macedonia. Thus, it is not odd to hear non-argumented critique about the number of audiences for contemporary art versus the large number of audiences for mainstream contemporary or modern art, and conceptual misunderstanding of concepts of "development" versus "growth". We have to bear in mind that such policy was present for more than 10 years in Macedonia, and oriented the general agenda of culture towards the mainstream valorisation of culture and art.

In the "liquid society", in Bauman's terms, in which the art is produced, we have non-constant working conditions, financial support, or security that makes it possible to reflect, contextualise, and rethink the position. In the "liquidity", artists and cultural workers have to float from one project to another, from one residence to another, one festival to another, and

so on, in order to secure the next income or creation. Not only in Macedonia, but also more widely, they are part of the "projectisation", supported through the politics of mobility, one of the assets of the neoliberalisation of the market, directly and constantly enhancing the liquidity in which authors are becoming more precarious. In such circumstances, authors become detached from the context, from the community, from any form of union or coherence from where they can critically reflect or advocate for policies reformations. Therefore, the systems of solidarity and certain responsibility towards any community or context are brought under scrutiny. The problem here is not found in the policies supporting the mobility or networking, but in the domination of such policies upon the ones that would be counter policies supporting contextual research processes and creations, creating the facilities in which the working conditions will be secured by permanent venture.

The domination of policy instruments supporting the neoliberalisation of the art sphere and the investment into the logic of profit through the creative industries does monopolize the artistic society. Such policies primarily dominating on EU level are indirectly supporting the indolent national policies in certain turbulent environments (especially the ones oriented towards promoting their national "grandiose" through culture), the language and values which are oriented towards entertainment, spectacle, canonisation, formatting, and institutional conservativism in relation to the production processes. The production process (performing arts) allows the creation of specific professional characteristics, or jobs that meet the market needs. For example, the creation of spectacle performances that would be seen by numerous audiences and would promote and affect the larger public (at the same time promoting the ideas of grand national values), would support the mainstream production processes where the machinery relates to certain workers who will be qualified for a certain job to be created on the education market. The space for new or experimental institutional formats that would allow shifts of certain positions which would create possibilities for self-

education, as well as self-reflection of the processes, procedures, protocols, and so on, forwarding the instituting of new working conditions is shrinking. Such political impetus globally, but moreover nationally, unifies the regulations, and therefore, unifies the cultural field as one that supports the existing, the visible, the possible, and the desired. Hence, it excludes the chances of new, prosperous, innovative, experiment, critical, reflective, and works on the neutralisation of the cultural field, as one to be easily controlled, or regulated, or to be misused for support of the nationalistic policies, populist ideologies, being able to justify its existence through proposed instruments and indicators - the market needs.

If we are theorizing and favouring only such policies and existing models, and we do not find models in which we will develop the "new, experimental, innovative", we will enable the social exclusion and further protect the "normalisation of precarisation", to put in Isabel Loray's words.

The supporting idea of this thesis is to envision the model and propose the methodology where different or diversified art and cultural works can be enabled, or where the institution will be socially aware and sensitive. Such methodology or model based on deploying the idea that only a system that allows the creation of new values, democratic, plural, diverse societal approach can support the institutional changes. These changes are less possible in certain contexts mostly because of geopolitical influences on the one hand, and on the other by the indolent system that reproduces the values of "grand" – market, ideas, nations, and so on. Another important issue to be emphasized is the global market orientation towards the immaterial labour, or service oriented societies which are supported by developed technology, which plays the most important role in the information, or post-fordist, or post-industrial societies. This also certainly affects the arts and the role of the art, as well as the production processes in which art is created. In his seminal essay *The work of art in the age of Mechanical reproduction* (1936), Walter Benjamin discusses how the technicalisation of

the production processes will reshape the arts, the perception towards arts, and even the nature of the arts. Here, I also want to emphasize his observations about the aura of the art work, or its originality and uniqueness as characteristics and qualities of the authentic art work that will be lost in the mechanic reproduction (Benjamin, [1968] 2010). The mechanic reproduction is the basis of the informatics societies or even more the creative industries.

Moreover, here, and above, the goal is to overview policies and environment, context conditions in order to establish the relation of the envisaged model of institution of contemporary performing arts, or socio-political and economic conditions, which are globally produced and being adapted on national or self-colonized (to use Kjosev's notion) contexts such as Macedonia. In its 26 years of independence, the Macedonian society has not succeeded in (or it is still in the process of) producing new values, establishing the notions of citizen, human rights, diversity, and other, which would allow the basis from which the geopolitical situation can be read through the established meanings. In such an environment, policies produced by the dominating nations or unions (the EU) which are implicitly regulating the sphere of culture, can be perverted and used even more for reproduction of the nationalism justified through neoliberal instruments and measures. In other words, contextualizing contemporary dance, performance, and choreography in relation to politically diverse, but also economically conditioned -west/east-, having in mind the historical role of the institution in the West, and the traditional meaning and governing of the institution in ex-Yugoslavia. Thus, how those relations are forming the context in which we talk about institution, or understand the role of institution, or more precisely, institution of dance and performance in this case and its relation to the theatre as established or nationalized institution, or ballet, and other. Moreover, it is necessary to research deeper how all these circumstances, which are forming the paradigm of the institution of culture and art are

possibly going in two general directions: the *"institution as a production of aesthetics"* and the *"institution as social agent"*.

This proposal is with the aim to convert, or to destabilize such an environment which neutralizes the cultural field by seeing the institution only through its role of production of aesthetics (that also produce narratives, identities, and other), and enable diversity of cultural production, specifically in the dance field. Therefore, we need to invest in theoritizing the formats, modalities, and forms from the aspect of critical theory, but also through management in culture, as well as from the policy in culture, in order to rethink the conditions in which new artistic work can be created, or innovation can be supported, or to think about the institution as producer of sociality or as socially relevant, or as a social agent.

Destabilization comes in ex-Yugoslavia, or the general East, from the civil society, or the independent sector, and aims to propose diverse solutions, or models of instituting new dance practices and aesthetics through new models of institutions of dance.

Currently, in 2018, there are few different initiatives taking place. One is in Croatia, mentioned in the beginning of this thesis, and aims to create a civil-public model of dance centre (Ožegović, 2017), another one is the creation of Kino Kultura – centre for contemporary performing arts and culture in Skopje, which I will discuss as a methodology of modelling, or as an empirical example of the "institution as a social agent" in this thesis, and also in Bulgaria and Slovenia. It will be presented as an Appendix – Case Study.

In Bulgaria, there are few initiatives, such as the Act Association for Independent Theatre initiative, which is related to the formation of Toplocentrala- Centre For Contemporary Arts where dance is also integrated partly in partnership with the city of Sofia, and another is the SYNERGY - Center for Contemporary Performing Arts, dedicated to dance in a larger performing arts scope, and also in partnership with the city of Sofia. These initiatives were presented by Angelina Georgieva, at the event Nomad Dance Advocates, organized by

Nomad Dance Academy and Station- service for contemporary dance from Belgrade, in Belgrade, on 20 and 21 October 2017. This advocacy initiative was organized in Skopje in 2012 and in Sofia in 2015, being developed as a continuous program for advocating for the development of contemporary dance art in the region. [71]

Initiatives in Bulgaria are coming as a result of a long advocacy for the need of establishing a centre for independent arts. In the last two years, the Association for Independent Theatre with the support of the Sofia Municipality initiated a process of wide professional and public discussions and concrete work on preparing written proposals for:

- Organizational model of a Centre for Contemporary Arts and a reconstruction of an abandoned heating plant in the centre of Sofia, now property of the city.
- Model for reorganization of one of the 5-6 municipal cultural institutes into a centre for contemporary performing arts.

Contemporary dance and performance is represented in both cases.

In addition, in 2016 again, the Association for Independent Theatre with the support of the Sofia Municipality conducted a process for working out a strategy for development of the independent art scene in the City of Sofia. In the policy paper developed by the City council and the beneficiaries, establishing of a contemporary dance centre until 2020 is on the agenda.

---

[71] http://lokomotiva.org.mk/lokomotiva-center-for-new-initiatives-in-arts-and-culture-as-one-of-the-nomad-dance-academy-partner-at-nomad-dance-advocates-in-belgrade-2017/ Nomad Dance Advocates was a gathering of artists and policy and decision makers where they can communicate and exchange experiences in a different, more direct and positive way. The idea behind this is to show the world of contemporary dance to the decision makers from a different perspective. Through the performative and less formal communication and discussions, games and art works, the representatives of ministries of culture, city administrations and other decision making bodies encounter artists, discover the world behind the stage and get a better insight into the potentialities of contemporary dance in today's cultural space. More about the Advocacy events in Skopje 2012, and Sofia 2015. on www.nomaddanceacademy.org, *and nomaddanceinstitute.tumblr.com/*

In Slovenia, the initiative goes further in the direction of establishing a public institution, or institute. Information is provided by Rok Vevar in interview. The steps towards opening a public institution of dance, an ongoing initiative, are the following: (1) at the Ministry of Culture of RS, a group of representatives had three meetings and several consultations, after the Minister of Culture in March 2017, and the Slovenian Dance Platform Gibanica announced the reopening of the Centre for Contemporary Dance Arts (abbreviation in Slovenian CSPU), established in 2011, and after the change of government was abolished in 2013; (2) Establishment / Funding of CSPU, as required by the document National Program for Culture 2018-25, which is confirmed by the Slovenian Parliament and which, after the public discussion is still in the preparation phase, - it is related to one property (house) - theatre (Ministry of Culture and City of Ljubljana have an argument: "We do not have real estate / public house for that institution.") (3). Group of representatives have insisted at the meetings that CSPU is not an NGO organization to which the state grants a concession to conduct public work in the field of culture, but something that is called the "public institute" (a public institution such as the National Theatre, the City Theatre, Mladinski theater, and so on) because the law implements these forms of public institution, stable funding and change of management every 5 years (the Slovene dance company in principle would not have any second thoughts on another form of organization that would perform public affairs in the area if there was a legal possibility for it, and if the other form of organization would really be the guaranteed conditions for the financed work). It is very important for the initiative that this story is not privatized with the concession, but that the procedure requires a change of mandate with a mandate, which, according to the law on public institutions, changes every 5 years (in the statute it is possible to foresee the maximum number of mandates belonging to one management) ; (4) At the second meeting, somewhat late in May 2017, the Association

of Contemporary Dance (abbreviation in Slovenian DSPS[72]) proposed to the Ministry of culture as a model of CSPU, which would be a registered institution and which would be, within the agreed period, until it acquires its own real estate (by 2025 for example), carried out in the existing network of public institutions with their own real estate (Ljubljana's Cankar's House, SNG Ljubljana, SNG Maribor, SNG Nova Gorica, Anton Podbevšek Theater Novo mesto, and other). Individuals can have their own space there and run their programs. In agreement with the institutions, where individuals would have worked as a guests, there would have been regulated working conditions, defined with time and space, number of productions, premieres, repetitions, and other (5) CSPU would have its own annual budget of at least 800,000 Euro, and the minimum number of employees, seven (in this planning, Simon Kardum, Director of cultural center Kino Šiška also helped); (6) there is a legal possibility of collective (3-party) management (PPP), but this legal option has never been implemented by the Ministry of Culture, and therefore, the The association of contemporary dance is inclined to propose collective leadership;(7) The Association of contemporary dance expressed its opinion that the CSPU should recognize and stimulate the potentials that already exist on the independent scene in the field of contemporary dance and do not do some parallel stories. This means that CSPU should represent all that is present in contemporary dance in Slovenia, without an institutional representation (for example, a representation would have meant a legally protected area of professional working conditions, financing, and artistic work).[73]

[72] DSPS = Društvo za sodobni ples Slovenije, Association of cultural workers in field of contemporary dance, (NGO formed in May 1994 with aim to be an advocacy platform for contemporary dance)

[73] Excerpts from the R.Vevar interview on 30.10.2016

In Slovenia, there are currently several places that support contemporary dance, but there is no institution dedicated only on contemporary dance (See Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski in consultation with Založnik, 2012).

In Serbia, there is no such strong initiative so far concerning the dance institution. However, Station – Service for contemporary dance is proactive in advocating and directing its future goals in the same direction. Today, they are using the space Magacin, which is a space owned by the City of Belgrade, but in use of the independent scene organizations supported by NKSS (abbreviation in Serbian of Association of the independent cultural scene).

Thus, if we can draw some conclusions on the basics and specificities concerning contemporary dance in the ex-Yugoslavia region, it might be said that it is a new field that started being developed at the end of the 90s and post 2000s, and is still in development. Therefore, there are still no institutions, or adequate, or satisfactory infrastructural conditions. Furthermore, there is no structural support, and no instruments that would support cross-border collaboration since the dance field has its necessity for that. It is therefore still a project based field, time related field, and specific policy measures and procedures are needed. Since the 90s there have been many initiatives that include bottom-up strategies of internationalisation, self-organization, advocacy, and lobbing (partnerships with the public sector), and mediation.

Dance needs to be explicitly included in the cultural policies, and not as part of the theatre, or scene arts, since dance, as a field, is an already diversified field that needs separate or specified approaches (ballet, modern, contemporary dance). Furthermore, dance policies also have to be considered in:

- Education policies – dance should be included both in primary schools and in secondary schools. High education in the field has to be supported (there is education in Slovenia, Macedonia, and Croatia);

- Dance in international relations policies – it has to be included in the regional collaboration strategies, as well as in the international. However, unfortunately in Macedonia, culture is not included in foreign affairs. Cultural diplomacy should consider the dance field.
- Labour policies – should strengthen instruments for support of the choreographers, dancers, performers, but also other cultural workers who contribute to the development of the field, such as managers, producers, dramaturges, theoreticians, curators, light designers, and so on.

6.3 Cultural policy making and development

Artist driven policies, or community-driven policies, are possible through processes of participative governance. The processes of participative governance in culture introduced models of public-private, or public-civil partnership, have been developed as practice predominantly in Croatia and as part of the region of ex-Yugoslavia. Hereby, we will closely overview these experiences and propositions, and overview the possibilities for their formation through the legislative frame in the context of Macedonia.

6.3.1Participative methodology of policy making

When talking about artist driven cultural policies, we are also talking about participative methodologies in policies development in the field. Unfortunately, in the ex-Yugoslavia context such approach is rare, or is misinterpreted.

There are several examples of different events depicting that policy changes have been advocated for decades, but unfortunately very little, or no significant changes have taken place in the ex-Yugoslavia region. The best examples can be found in Croatia where some professionals are dedicated on this problematic.

Participative democratic processes are only possible in the context of political maturity, and I would also add ethical maturity for that matter. Otherwise, participation stays on the declarative level.

"The theoretical framework on participatory governance in culture is generally deficient and reduced to random, yet a growing number of scholarly articles examine participatory governance in culture (Sørensen, Kortbek and Thobo-Carlsen 2016; Jancovich 2011; 2015; 2017)" (Žuvela, 2018, p.71).

In the region, there are several examples of models of institutions based on the methodology of participatory governing such as the public- civil model of Pogon in Croatia, as a pioneer one. However, other examples of similar initiatives can also be found.

The word 'governance' has a double meaning. It is both a synonym of 'government' and 'authority' and also refers to a "management system" of an organization.

Therefore, when talking about participatory governance in culture we can distinguish two levels as in the *Brainstorming Report PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE IN CULTURAL HERITAGE (July 2015)*[74], as: - *Participatory government* - *Participatory authority and Participatory management system.*

The concept 'participatory' refers to the activities in which people take part. So, the combination of 'participatory' and these three concepts (government, authority, and management system) implies that government, authority, and management (all of which

[74] For elaboration and further information on participatory governance in culture, more details can be found online at http://www.goethe.de/mmo/priv/14903520-STANDARD.pdf and http://kulturanova.hr/file/ckeDocument/files/Radna_biljeznica.pdf

terms related to power) should be shared with people, with the citizens to whom the heritage belongs. As Arnstein ([1969] 2004) explains, "participation without redistribution of power is an empty and frustrating process for the powerless". [75]

The emergence of the new models based on participatory governance in culture has many reasons and drivers behind it. The most prominent ones are the increasing inequality in the cultural policy structures and the treatment of the cultural sector, the crisis of the representative democracy or the large inequality between the decision makers and the artists, or the "scene".

There are deficits in the democratic traits in cultural policy decision-making processes and such trend is raising insecurity and precariousness of the cultural and artistic work. Cultural workers have been directed towards commodification of their works which affects the content, quality, but also the development of the public sphere. There is a misuse of the public goods and public sphere by the decision makers, or a lack of social responsibility in political governance of public resources. Thus, there is redundancy of the conventional and traditional articulations of cultural interests and public needs in culture.

These and other reasons are taken in consideration by Dea Vidović, Davor Mišković and Ana Žuvela, who have elaborated diverse aspects of the participatory governance in culture in Croatia in the ""Priručnik: Uradi sam – DKC".

In line with these reasons and some other as well, participatory governance is taken as one of the possible approaches in Croatia and also in other countries in ex-Yugoslavia, including Macedonia. It is one of the alternatives to overcome some, if not most of the issues that are hindering a more balanced and sustainable cultural development. However, it must be noted that participation as a method is not considered uncritically as a remedy for all social

[75] In http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html, Originally published as Arnstein, Sherry R. A Ladder of Citizen Participation, JAIP, Vol. 35, No. 4, July 1969, pp. 216-224.

maladies, but is tested as a one of the approaches for reconstructing the existing policy provisions or providing alternative ones.

Participation, as such, is contextually applicable as it has historical legacies in the ex-Yugoslavia countries. Self-management was a practice during the last stage, or the second half of the former Yugoslav federation. Participation should not be understood as a resonance of self-management, but rather as a response that has certain correlations not only with institutional, policy or governing memory, but also with community relation and societal habit of being involved and included.

In order to ensure efficient and stable participatory governance, it is necessary to define each element in accordance with the needs and specifics of the local context and social conditions. In the ""Priručnik: Uradi sam – DKC", Dea Vidović (2015, p.64) proposes division and grouping of those elements into several groups, for example in the following three groups: **constituting** (statute of organization, and formulation of governing process where modifications are influencing strategies and operational elements) **, strategic** (referring to the creation of policy and resource usage rules and directly influencing the operating group of elements) **and operational elements** (implies a set of elements that are carried out on an everyday basis and help in the implementation of defined rules in groups of constitutive and strategic elements).

While working, or during the processes of participatory governance, stakeholders for each group should set up a set of elements that will be jointly agreed and transparently accessible to everyone involved in the participatory management processes.

Dea Vidović (2015, p.63) also considers and proposes several possible models as an interconnecting combination of three main registers: *public*, *civil*, and *private*. Vidović is listing participatory governance models of socio-cultural institutions, or centres based on civil-public partnerships as follows:

The Model of Extended Co-operation or **delegated responsibility-** Public and Civil Sector Cooperation has been established solely at the level of providing public resources to the civil sector on governance and use for limited time, without "payment" - with obligation to the public sector to cover part of the material costs of using the infrastructure and the civil sector secures public use (- program - cultural and social) of the spatial resources.

Model of co-governance or collaborative governance - partnership of a public institution with a certain number of civil society organizations for the purpose of joint management of the use of space in public infrastructure under the responsibility of a public institution.

Model of joint governance - the formation of a joint public property governance body with an equal number of representatives of the public and the civil sector.

Hybridization Model - a partnership between the public and the civil sector in fostering and co-ordinating a new joint institution that takes the role of public resource management or governance with the public resources (Vidović, 2015, p.63)

The existing examples from the countries of the region (ex-Yugoslavia) indicate the emergence of *civil-public partnership* model (Croatia - Pogon) as opposing to conventional *public-private partnerships* which have proven to have detrimental consequences for the public interest in favour of the private one. In addition, the perspective of *public-private-civil partnership* has been discussed, although only on theoretical or conceptual level. *Civil-private partnership* has not been noted as a practice as yet, although it forms a concept that is interesting from the aspect of rethinking public relevance and amplification of the public value and meanings of culture.

To overview the possibility of developing a public-private (civil) model, we have to investigate the legal frameworks that have their own regulative standpoints in each context.

We need to overview and indicate if these legal frameworks are open to the level of hybridisation. According to such levels, the choice between one legal format over the other becomes clearer (that is, the option should be the legal format that allows for most operational and governing flexibility, hybridity, and adaptability).

6.3.1.1 Macedonia – PPP and mixed or hybrid model[76]

The existing examples from the countries of the region (namely Croatia) indicate the emergence of a *civil-public partnership* model or under the law (namely in Macedonia) a hybrid or mixed institution. A mixed institution is normatively a *public – private partnership* since the civil sector is part of the "private" sector by law. According to the law, private are all legal forms that are not public (state owned), and these are: private, as profit making organizations, and private, as non-profit, or civil society organizations.

However, there is a large difference between the two sectors, private as profit oriented, and civil as non-profit oriented, which supports the development of public and citizen needs.

A mixed institution is taken into consideration in the Law on Institutions[77] and has been regulated also by another law, namely the Law on Concession and Public Private

[76] This part has been researched by the author of this thesis and her colleagues, and parts of it are included and published in the text Kino Kultura – Project Space for Contemporary Performing Arts and Contemporary Culture, by Biljana Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski and Violeta Kachakova, in *Modeling Public Spaces in Culture, Rethinking Institutional Practices in Culture and Historical (Dis)continuities*, ed.by Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, Bodrožić and Kachakova. PPP in Macedonia has been researched by the author for the purposes of this thesis, as well as by the author and a colleague Ivan Toromanovski for the purposes of the project Dissonant co-spaces, see more on www.lokomotiva.org.mk

[77] Law on Institutions, "Official Gazette of R. Macedonia, no, 32/05, 11.05.2005" – A mixed institution is established with state finances, i.e. finances of the municipality, i.e. the City of Skopje and finances of a domestic and foreign legal and physical entity or an institution established with state finances or finances of the municipality, i.e. the City of Skopje and finances of a domestic and foreign legal and physical entity.

Partnerships[78]. A public – civil partnership is not considered as such with the normative acts and laws in Macedonia, but is regulated with the mentioned laws and subsequent by-laws and acts. In Macedonia, in the past, many hybrid or mixed institutions, or public – private partnerships were organized under the Law on Concession and Public – Private Partnerships only for profit oriented purposes, not for cultural purposes. Therefore, such regulations have proven to have detrimental consequences for the public interest in favour of the private (commercial) one.

In addition, apart from a *civil-private partnership,* we can also consider the perspective of a *public-private-civil partnership*, which has not been noted as a practice yet.

According to the Law on Culture[79] in Macedonia, an institution is formulated as: "(1) A legal entity performing activities in the field of culture, with a non-profit purpose." (Article 18). In the next Article 19, it is underlined that an institution can be founded by a domestic or foreign physical or legal entity. An institution can perform activities in different domains in culture regulated by law. Article 20 of the Law, prescribes that an institution can be private or public. A public institution can be municipal or city (founded by the local self-government) or national (founded by the state), while a private is founded by a physical or legal entity.

Thus, under the Law on Culture, Macedonia allows for only private and public institutions, which is not aligned with the Law on Institutions, which prescribes a mixed model of

[78] Law on Concessions and Public Private Partnerships "Official Gazette of R. Macedonia, no. 6/201 and 144/2014". The Law defines in details a public –private partnership – "A public-private partnership is a form of long-term cooperation between a public and private partner, regulated with a contract, with the following characteristics...".

[79] Law on Culture, consolidated – unofficial refined text (Official Gazette of R. Macedonia, no. 31/98, 49/03, 82/05, 24/07, 116/10, 47/11, 51/11, 136/12, 23/13, 187/13, 44/14, 61/15, 154/15, 39/16, 11/18 and 11/18 - Decision of the Constitutional Court of R.M. U.no.196/2007 from 16.1.2008, published in "Official Gazette of R.M., no. 15/2008) (www.kultura.gov.mk)

institutions, or as mentioned under the Law on Institutions[80], there are three types of organizations: public, private, and mixed or hybrid, namely public–private.

The normative frame for a public-private partnership as mentioned can be found in the Law on Concession and Public – Private Partnerships, which regulates the concession of public goods. The basic characteristic of this collaboration is that the private partner undertakes the responsibility to provide public service to users in domains in the competence of the public partner, and/or the responsibility to ensure to the public partner the necessary conditions for providing public services to users and/or activities in its competence.

According to the Law, all agreements for establishing a public-private, (civil) partnership in which public partners (national, local or municipal, public institutions, enterprises, and other legal entities identified with the Law) are obliged to award contracts to private partners in accordance with the principles of transparency, non-discrimination, proportionality, efficiency, equal treatment, and mutual recognition.

A grantor can be the Republic of Macedonia, the municipalities and the City of Skopje, while a public partner, in addition to the Republic of Macedonia, the municipalities and the City of Skopje, can be among other, different legal entities executing public powers in the area of public authorization (in this case NGOs, associations) according to the law. According to this, a Public – Private Partnership can be realized as:

1. Contracting PPP, for which the public and private partner sign an agreement implemented by the private partner or the legal entity established by the private partner;
2. Institutional PPP, where the public and private partner appear as co-founders of the legal entity implementing the PPP agreement.

[80] Law on Institutions (Official Gazette of R.M., no. 32/05 from 11.05.2005).

The Law on Public-Private Partnership (PPP) in the Republic of Macedonia regulates all elements required for the two partners (at least) to enter into contract. However, the Law in some crucial respects related to the development of successful contracts is not sufficiently clear and relies on negotiations between the partners. It is not much in favour of content related to culture, especially if this is not commercial, or related to profit making.

One may say, therefore, that this Law is not related to the Law on Culture where both private and public institutions have to be non-profit, or maybe it is the reason why there is no PPP in the Law on Culture, or a mixed institution as in the Law on Institutions. One can conclude that according to the Law, PPP can only be profit-oriented if it remains regulated as it is, and if there is no clear distinction in the Law on PPP that it is non-profit and it can be modelled as public – private, public – civil, and/or public-private-civil. The clear distinction would be a public purpose and non-profit versus profit-making.

Such policy recommendation is with the aim to overcome the practical use or the needs we are now witnessing with Kino Kultura, as well as possible other models of institutions.

Within the Law of PPP (Article 5), public - private partnership comprehends all partnerships which can be developed among legal entities defined by law as public or private. Public can be assets or entities on local and national level, and private are civil society as well as private organizations, or legal entities. However, it can be noticed that the types of partnerships mostly imply involvement of the private partner in a capacity of financing the infrastructural development and/or reconstruction. This is not limited only to infrastructure, but it also allows provision of services (or providing content for example, in relation to cultural and art organizations). However, in cases of provision of services, the law does not provide any guidance as to how and to what extent the public partner can participate in the design of the public service or its monitoring and evaluation. While the financing of the infrastructural

project is exact and can be easily measured, the *provision of services* is much more complex and requires socio-economic and cultural indicators.

In order to apply such a qualitative approach, related to provision of content or programme in case of a public – private (civil) partnership, we need to develop a specific law on public – private non-profit partnership in culture, related to the Law on Culture.

The general Law on Concession and PPP, under Article 9, regulates concession fees. It stipulates that the payments for the concessions are paid based on a feasibility study for the justification of awarding a concession for goods of public interest. While it can certainly be expected that a feasibility study is developed, the law does specify if an ex-post evaluation is needed. In addition, it does not specify what the key elements and evaluations of the feasibility study are. Such a study cannot only take into account *the cost-benefit* of such cooperation, but also the quality and the quantity of the public services provided.

A more in-depth analysis of the Law is needed in order to understand that such a law is not in favour of a potential model oriented towards development of the public cultural content, or relevant for socio-cultural development or development of the public sphere in culture.

The PPP in policy is seen as a model for development and management of various public institutions and services. It arises from the need for development of a functional model ("market" - driven model) for governing public institutions, which assumes that it provides value-for-money ratio, for the services offered, which is greater than the traditional approach – a public institution delivering services. In sum, the PPP models are market-driven for optimization of the monetized value of the services offered.

Kino Kultura (to be presented as case study) is an initiative of civil and private actors, which also have a contractual relationship with other private entities over the infrastructure.

It does not strive towards PPP as understood and explained above, or developed through the legal forms in Macedonia, but as a specific form of a partnership between public-private-civil

entities aiming to produce public content that would reform the destroyed public sphere. The public space that will give back the possibility to the public sphere to operate politically and enable deliberation processes through arts and culture.

6.4 Shared policy for new public culture, or from paternalistic institution to (post)modern institution

In the context of ex-Yugoslavia, in the past year, there were different attempts for development of the civil – public partnerships, or hybridized models, which have various functions, from service, to production houses, to socio-cultural or spaces for culture and youth, embracing diverse art expressions and broader cultural activities.

These initiatives are developed on the basis of the participative governing which has become popular, as mentioned, in the past years in the cultural and art practices, as well as in the academic circles. Participative governing in culture can be seen in the bodies of the European Commission through the use of the methods of open coordination, for example (Open Method of Coordination), whereby they have included representatives of the civil sector in the consultation processes around soft law regulations of the EU Commission.

In ex-Yugoslavia, in the last couple of years, a theme related to participative governance and public-civil cultural centres has been actualized. First, as mentioned above, this model was developed in Zagreb, Croatia, with the establishment of Pogon, under the idea of socio-cultural centres. Socio-cultural centres are relating their activities to the social and cultural issues and phenomena, and such idea is related to the model of public – private (civil) partnership that holds the idea of shared policies (Dragićević Šešić, 2006, p.105). Shared policies influence the traditional decision-making and governing with the cultural activities

that are directed from the centre. The private (civil) partnership model decentralises the decision-making power in relation to the organization model, as well as programming. In Macedonia, as mentioned in the Chapter above, models of governing with the culture can be realized through two models. These are: *private initiative*, to which business organizations, art organizations, associations, and other belong, which are co-financed by the public funds, and *public institution* that is established by the state, and its governing organization model is regulated through the Law on Culture and the Law on Public Institutions that was also described above. Also, to emphasize again, in the Law on Culture there are two types of institutions: public and private, and in the Law on Public Institutions there is another type which is mixed, or hybrid.

The model of a hybrid Institution can be realized through participative governance that includes three dimensions: participative public administration, participative leadership/management, and participative system of management. Governance, here, is understood as a synonym for public governance and management, which can also be understood as organizational governance/management.

This methodology is related to the mentioned *shared policies approach* proposed by Milena Dragičević Šešić (2006) in her text *Shared Policies: the Future of Cultural Development – New Models of Partnership Between the Public, Private and Civil Sectors.* She proposes:

> […] "shared policies" as legitimate ones in contemporary world, and that mutual complementary enrichment of researchers and policy makers coming from all three sectors will be beneficiary for the creation of new, more democratic standards in policy making. The synergy of the elected power (government and its main ideology), expert power (public and private cultural institutions) and socially responsible forces (NGO sector) who approach the process of policy making from different standpoints will definitely contribute to ensuring that "territory driven cultural policy"1 will

prevail instead of "constructed community driven cultural policy" (nation building or "dreaming") (Dragićević Šešić and Dragojević, n.d.). (Dragićević Šešić, 2006)

Dragićević Šešić (2006) also proposes to define the method of creating cultural policy within the EU as territory driven cultural policies. Contemporary cultural policies are oriented towards the citizen, the individual in the entire territory of the country. The territorially conceptualized principles of cultural policy, or territorially (state) conceptualised/motivated cultural policy (Dragićević Šešić and Dragojević, 2006) are putting the citizen and the entire territory of one country in the centre of the attention. It is a cultural policy based on a civil concept which is also an ideological concept versus the traditional or ethnical. The civil concept of cultural policy differentiates from the cultural politics that is based on the ethnic community that is constructed as national, and works with the instruments of "cultural representation" of the state and nation, preservation and promotion of the cultural identity. The territorially conceptualised cultural policy presents pluralism, diversity, or ideas, actions, concepts, and enhancement of new production processes and cultural content. Such cultural policy approach is inclusive, and involves diverse cultural content produced in the public, private, and civil sector, and is based on the participative governing. In this relation, she points out that the main issue has become: "How are the cultural institutions linked up with their territories?" and not anymore with their (national) community?" (Dragićević Šešic, 2006, p.105).

Having in mind that in many countries such method is not accepted and there is large obsession with the second approach, which emphasizes "ethnicity" as the key element of self-identification, trying to conceive and conceptualize cultural policy for the imagined (constructed) community", the concept of shared cultural policies cannot be applied (Dragićević Šešić, 2006, p.105).

In the “ethnicity” orientation concept, institutions are heavily centralized, but territory driven cultural policies are addressing not only the “nation” institutions and artists, but also all the involved operators on the territory. Therefore, cultural policies priorities are developed through participative governing and involving the actors through forums and debates.

We can also witness public – private partnerships (or 3ps) including three sectors, public, private, civil, which should be in permanent dialogue and interaction (Dragićević Šešić, 2006, p.106). These partnerships can vary from public-civil, public–private or private–civil, or public-civil-private partnership, and can give a balanced approach that can widen the policy perspectives by bringing together diverse knowledge.

Dragićević Šešić is proposing a scheme through which we can see the positive aspects of the contribution of the three sectors in their involvement in the policy making in the mentioned text, although this has been more developed in the recently published text (Dragićević Šešić and Drezgić, 2018).

Table 2: Positive aspects of the three sectors

PUBLIC	**PRIVATE**	**CIVIL**
Traditional values Professional knowledge and skills	Modern values Transversal skills (communication, fundraising, etc.)	Social values (solidarity, new culture of memory, intercultural sensitivity, social/distributive justice)
Identity building	Risk orientation	Inclusivity

Appreciations of old elites	Elitism and leadership	Equality
Institution building	Organization building	Movements
Museums, archives and libraries	Companies, enterprises & agencies	Circles, clubs, NGOs
Past	Future	Present
High standard routine in the main domain of operation	Innovation, new solutions, new markets & products	Social experiment, dialogue, participation
Oeuvre	Product	Process

Dragićević Šešić and Drezgić (2018) propose the following negative features that can appear:

Table 3: Negative aspects of the three sectors

Sclerotisation	Commercialization Consumerism	Propagandas
Bureaucratization	Oversimplification	Amateurism (diminishing of professional standards)
Culture as value per se	Culture as economic investment & job provider	Culture as a tool of social change

This scheme depicts the relations to which new models of cultural institutions are the result, or in other words, new models of institutions can be supported through shared policies approach. Through the proposed chart we can see what sectors can bring separately, but also

understand that these domains intersect. In many contexts, the leader of the changes is the civil sector, and the analysis of cultural policies in the countries with underdeveloped civil society has shown that there is a significant lack of instruments, mechanisms, and organization/governing models. However, in the culture of entrepreneurship and neoliberal state, such as Great Britain for example, models of creative industries have been proposed, developed, and dominated the larger cultural sphere. The political orientation, or the basis of the political context, does influence the strengthening of a certain sector, such as in the mentioned case of creative industries, the private, which is at the same time the most powerful and dominating in that socio-political and economic context.

6.4.1 From shared policies and participative governance to rhizomatic governance and institution model (imagining)

The countries of ex-Yugoslavia are new democracies which have the chance to develop new meanings and functions of cultures, with new qualities, or a post-national culture that can enhance pro-active tendencies and solutions of problems of development. Such post-national culture can be founded upon the *shared policies* approach, on the basis of which we can start developing new post-institutional models, or as mentioned above, new models based on participative or even *rhizomatic governance* that would bring forward heterogeneity of the active re-imagining of the institutions. These models of post-institutions are created on the basis of:

> post-imperial, post-colonial and post – national culture would give way to new expressions of creativity, identity, tolerance, work, cooperation, interdependence and solidarity, ones that the old (metropolitan) cultures have either suppressed or

> dismantled in favour of hierarchies, centrality, supremacy, exclusion, friction, cleansing, or even extermination of others. (Katunarić, 2005, p.38)

The shared policies also have to be based on the shared visions and goals that would overcome or dismantle nationalism or ethnocentrism, any prejudice and xenophobia.

Such an approach is a precondition for carrying out any reforms of the cultural system, the public spaces in culture, or it is the future of the cultural development within each country, region, and city. Dragićević Šešić (2006, p.108) would add: "Cultural policy has to be an integral part of public responsibility; it means responsibility for all the main vectors of cultural life, undertaken through precise procedures and in dialogue".

Furthermore, as Katunarić (2004) notes, public space in culture today is engaged by heterogeneous people who put their demands on it. Therefore, public spaces need conjoining and upgrading of the capacities of public and cultural policies, in order to cope with the obstacles to development of and within the public space.

The obstacles are the outbreak of intercommunal conflict and violence, as well as the commercialisation that has pressured downsize of the institution and its spatial scope. Privatisation reinforces the private mentality, that is, different prejudices such as racial or ethnic. On the other hand, the public sphere is "normatively based on the opposite values informing social opening, conflict migration, solidarity and civic ties stretched across group boundaries, different forms of economic co-operation, expanding democratic dialogue and democracy learning" (Habermas, 1989; Ku, 2000 cited in Katunarić, 2004, p. 20), and "last but not least, entertaining new forms of artistic and cultural experiences in order to consolidate social, economic and political qualities of the public sphere" (Katunarić, 2004, p.20).

We need to be playful and experiment, or imagine the processes of how we can re-shape modalities, the public sphere, and therefore, the public spaces, and fill them with diverse meanings. We need to be always re-imagining and re-establishing communication, leadership, planning, implementing, evaluating in the managing processes.

We can talk about *communal leadership* or *shared leadership* in the new models of governing with the cultural institutions. Participative governance allows this approach. Moreover, such leadership can be part of the management, or organizational governance, which is the rhizomatic model. This model is a proposition that allows diverse, interrelated connections, communications, and decisions to be effectuated.

Or, to use the concept of Deleuze and Guattari of the rhizome from *A Thousand Plateaus* and transform it, a rhizome institution, or organizational governance, will allow: multiple non-hierarchical entry and exit points in content creation, opposing the arbore scent or vertical and liner conceptualisation of knowledge, and content based on the same type of connections.

The rhizomatic institution therefore acts in its multiplicity by resisting the vertical organizational structure, through *shared leadership, self-organized communication systems, specific planning addressing the necessity, and evaluating the quality oriented indicators which are socially relevant*.

The rizomatic organization governance, or model, can be applied to the *"institutions as social agents"* or the institutions where socialites are produced. It can be characterized by "ceaselessly established connections between semiotic chains, organizations of power, and circumstances relative to the arts, sciences, and social struggles" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004, p.8).

Rather than narrativizing history and culture, the rhizome institution will produce and present *culture and art as map of influences, without genesis, without a beginning and an end, in its potentiality, or always in the middle, searching through different meanings.*

It should resist the chronology and homogenic approach, it should strive towards heterogenic approaches in reviewing the socially relevant issues, or nurture a contextually driven art and culture content.

7. Performing arts institution – An agent of societal and political transformations

(as Conclusion)

> The artists use their profession and various art mediums in a quite different way than as a simple critique of the political system of capitalism and neo-liberalism. Instead of miming or criticizing the reality, the artists enter its order and their ad inevitably becomes a part of everyday life, and not only by inserting new objects into it. Moreover, not only does art become a part of reality, but also it simultaneously changes it inside out. Thus, the artists become agents of the societal and political transformations. Such projects change the regimes of representations that are dependent on state power, as well as changing the way in which art functions. Therefore, I suggest that one should look at this kind of art as a unique way of entanglement, of different life realms (social, economical, or political) that deconstructs the understanding of art as an elitist and privileged system of signification isolated from quotidian life or from serious political involvement. (Milevska, 2011, p.22)

The above quote can be closely related to the art spaces, or art institutions as a subject, meaning that art institutions have to address the art works that change the regimes of representation, inscribed in the institution as a "production of aesthetic", and also deconstruct such role of the institution as an aesthetic signifier isolated from the quotidian life or political involvement, and strive towards the role of institution as an agent of societal and political transformations.

We are witnessing that this century brings new changes in the art aesthetics and production. The politics of economy, the social and public policies' shifts influenced changes in the

performing arts, from production to aesthetics, generally with the geopolitical changes. Thus, all these have created their impacts on state levels. The instability of the post-fordistic system of production, the financial crises, and the nationalistic "waves" are reflected in the art productions and regimes of representation. This has both positive and negative effects. There is a rise in nationalistic narratives supported through art poetics on the one hand, and on the other, there are new approaches in collaboration, new modes of thinking about governing, resources, community, knowledge production, and other, explored by the freelance and independent organizations, as well as the artists or where contemporary art forms of body related practices were mainly considered, and rarely in the public (state) institutions.

Within the last decade, we are witnessing that states, cities, and the "public" are under the pressure of the neoliberalism, and the state has less influence, unless it is "privately owned" or under governance for the wealth of a few, as in the case of Macedonia in the last period. Thus, the state has a tendency to withdraw, or to have minimal influence, and market dominance directs development, needs, production, ways of governing, organizing, and so on, which is influencing the aesthetics, art labour, or working conditions in the fields of culture and arts.

In these circumstances, public institutions become weaker, going through crises, especially since the paradigms in which a certain art form has been produced have shifted. Models and strategies of support of theatre have become anachronistic and not sufficient to address new forms of theatre, dance, performance, or new modes of creation that emerge.

In the new modes of creation of contemporary performing arts, the instability of post-fordist working systems is reflected. In Europe, we can witness the free-lancing of the cultural system, which destabilizes the established forms of the institutions created on the top-down principle as a stable infrastructure. Moreover, the cultural institutions in post-social states have fallen in disrepute due to their co-option for political interest.

The newly developed conditions of work and needs in the field of performing arts demand critical pondering, adaptation, deconstruction of old and construction of new models, approaches, and theories of the cultural institutions, in the case of this thesis, those working in the field of performing arts.

This thesis opened diverse questions related to the theoretical perspectives of the notion of the institution, the role of certain traditional models of cultural institutions, and how the new reflections on horizontally or commonly governed spaces as new institutions are arising. Understanding the historical role of the "Western Institution" as "production of aesthetics", we are putting forward questions that we are diligent with today, such as - How a space, or an institution for performing arts can be political, reflective, and pondering through the needs of art? - since institutions, as observed through this thesis, have a role to address the needs of the society, or in this case, of the artists and cultural workers. Or, how can we re-establish the ethics for the negotiations between the market and art, the state and art, the financial crises and art, politics and art, and so on?

7.1 The performing arts institution in Macedonia

There are 112 subsidised institutions in Macedonia, of which 63 have the status of national institutions, and 49 are local. [81]

[81] In accordance with Article 20 of the Law on culture ("Official Gazette of R. Macedonia" no. 31/98, 49/03, 82/05, 24/07, 116/10, 47/11, 51/11, 136/12, 23/13, 187/13, 44/14, 61/15, 154/15, 39/16 and 11/18) an institution from the field of culture, according to its founder, may be private or public. The public institution may be local (municipal-city) when established by the unit of local self-government, or national, when established by the state.

Table 4: Institutions in Macedonia

No.	Field	Number of national institutions	Number of local institutions
1	Library activities	5	13
2	Film activities	2	
3	Music and music-scene activities	2	
4	Drama activities	8	
5	Folklore activities	1	
6	Activities of centers of culture and houses of culture	16	28
7	Protection of cultural heritage	9	
8	Culture and art events	3	
9	Museum activities	16	6
10	Protection of audiovisual goods	1	
11	Zoos		2
	Total	**63**	**49**

Besides the above mentioned [82], of which there is only one institution for dance, the Macedonian National Ballet, there is a children theatre space as an independent space for performing arts, and there are no other spaces for dance, performance, DIY (experimental), or other forms of performing arts.

[82] Information provided by the administration of the Ministry of Culture for the purposes of organizing a common event, Arts Symposium, 5-6 June 2018, Skopje.

Therefore, Kino Kultura – Centre for contemporary performing arts and contemporary culture was formed, and will be presented as a case study in the Appendix of this thesis.

There is an erosion of the theatre in general, but moreover, due to the rapid succession of technology, or commercial content, the governing or managing of institutions in Macedonia as well, is unfortunately still on a very intuitive level and politically led (by the party in power), instead of professionally.

The interview carried out for the purposes of the event The Arts Symposium Skopje, Macedonia, organized by the U.S. Embassy in Macedonia in collaboration with the Ministry of Culture of R. Macedonia and NGO Lokomotiva –Centre for New Initiatives in Arts and Culture, shows that out of 89 answered questionnaires from the institutions and the NGOs, most of the NGOs reported having strategic planning, mission and vision of the institutions.[83]

More precisely, we did a Pre-Registration Assessment asking the interviewees to provide 2-3 sentences for each of the following questions: What is the mission of your organization?; Does your organization have a strategic plan?; Do you evaluate your institution?; What is your annual organizational budget (in U.S. dollars)?; Briefly list your organization's top two challenges (not including marketing); Briefly list your organization's top two marketing challenges; How many events do you organize or host annually?; How many productions/programs/events do you produce per year?, and, How many attendees do you have per year?.

Of the answered questionnaires, around 2/3 are from the public institutions (national and local) and 1/3 from the association, or NGOs.

[83] The Symposium will feature experienced and distinguished arts managers from the United States and the program is *designed for arts managers* in Macedonia who strive to further develop their leadership, managerial, financial, and planning skills. The program will provide tools to create, develop, facilitate, and evaluate cultural programs and organizations. Interested participants can sign up for individual consultations with the experts.

Concerning the question “What is the mission of your organization?”, nearly all interviewees explained the work of their institutions, or the core idea behind their institution or organization. Nearly all institutions do not have a strategic plan, and most of the answers show very small understanding of the strategy and its purpose. Evaluation is on the lowest level I would say on both, public institutions and NGOs. Regarding most of this, and the other questions, although we asked for a short explanation, yes or no answers were given without an explanation, or numbers.

This demonstrated a very low level of managerial skills, or understanding of the basic managerial processes. In such a position, reformation, or *strategies of internalisation* are only possible in collaboration with the civil society. However, as we have seen, such an approach can have both a positive and a negative impact, mostly on the civil society or the independent cultural scene. Another finding is that there is a large interest in capacities building in the field of management. However, visioning or imagining, or critical viewing of the institutional governance is present only on the part of NGOs.

In addition, I have to mention that the critics and the theory of art are also in decay, and thus, we do not have any reflection on the contents produced in the institutions, or their work.

With the new National Strategy for culture 2018-2022, the decentralisation of institutions is accented, or planned. With the – un-ready- decentralization we will have the decay of the spaces for culture, spaces for theatre, or public spaces, which have already been reduced due to prioritization of privatization through neoliberal capitalism. Such an approach will enable a greater impact of the already vulgarized culture and art that has been reduced to the free-market, in the sense of the “culturalization of the economy or, conversely, the economization of culture” (Grlja and Vesić, 2007).

The crises of the public sphere and the public space are not only associated with privatisation, or culturalisation of the economy, but they are also more broadly seen as crises of representation in a representative democracy (Vujanović and Cvejić, 2012).

The cultural institutions' crises are pointing to the crises of the public in general, of the public opinion and democracy through which the public is regulated.

Our public spaces, theatre or performing arts institutions, are public bodies that regulate certain political and economic relations through their management structure, and support or oppose a certain ideology by producing societal values. Therefore, the management structure of the institution can be seen as a spine that regulates the relations, values, and ideology, playing an important role in positioning the cultural institution as one that institutes new principles of work, production, and development of the art form - as a body that stands for the needs of the art field and a "community of practice", or a regulatory body of the politics in power.

Thus, we need to rethink what is the public space of theatre, dance, performance of today, what values we institute and how.

The post-modern organization theory is proposed in this thesis *as a methodological approach for the deconstruction of the modernist managerial paradigm* of the cultural institution which is *trying to amplify the voice* of one marginalized field, through offering new reflexive forms of theorizing and organizing. This perspective offers the post-modern managerial paradigm in culture, and is related to what has been suggested in the thesis as post-modern institution, co-institution, heterogenic management, self-organized systems. The method of forming such institution is through participative governance and rhizomatic governance (organizational) with shared leadership. It is related to the policy making approach of *shared policies* in Dragićević terms.

The thesis proposes an institution as a producer of sociality, or socially and politically relevant content versus the institution as a producer of aesthetics. Such an institution is situated in the field of *restricted production,* in Bourdieu's terms, where progressive approaches are possible, or in the field striving for the autonomy where the principles are determent by themselves, or in Simon Sheik's words, self-instituting is possible. They operate with strategies that would enhance the creation of a *culture of quality.*

In addition to this is the strategic approach of imagining the institution as a space of common, socially relevant, or contextualized, or institutions as agents of social and political changes that view culture as a resource for development of the public sphere.

Thinking of the institution as commons is an alternative to dominant commodification, exploitation, and privatization of the public resources and goods, where governing is a transformation power of social relations, since it is related to *collective responsibility, participative governing, and common responsibility towards public goods.*

Performing arts spaces/institutions are to be viewed in their potentiality as social spaces of commons, where noise exists, where we talk and experiment, when our and other bodies are transforming the space facilitating other bodies of diversities to be present.

Commons built under the three lines – resources, governing, and community - are to be viewed as a political alternative to the neoliberal, and a call for reorganization of a common life, an environment in which we live, work, create, or as reorganization of politics, economy, conditions, natural, and urban goods.

If we see culture, theatre, dance, performance as a resource, and not as a consumer, around which community is organized in different roles - as professionals, audiences - then we will see our institutions as a space where this resource is extended, developed, produced, disseminated through participative or *rhizomatic* mechanisms that enable the reformation of the institution as a space, content, a social, common space, a space we share.

Rhizomatic governance of the post-institution, co-institution as “common institution” or “agent for socio-political changes”, opts for collective or shared leadership, collaboration, co-mentoring, collaborative researches, co-curating, and so on, as only through such an approach we can overcame crises, or try out new methodological principles, to paraphrase Bojana Kunst. In agreement, I believe that thinking about institution and institutional practices in their potentialities, or as a co-governed space, space of common, can also be a new managerial logic, or post-managerial logic based on participative or rhizomatic managing that can allow us to draw different maps, or always be in the middle, imagining and searching through different meanings within the theatre, dance, and other art.

Such management can be supported by curating as a content building method that is brought to the performing arts institutions in order to redefine and contextualize the already homogenized idea of institution, or traditional repertoire approach, or the aesthetic driven impetus. This is nothing new as a proposal, one might say, however, it is a proposal about bringing forward thinking of the new politics of curating in performing arts.

The aim is to see curating as heterogeneity in programing, approaching, governing, thinking, deliberating, reflecting, acting, performing, or as a reflection on artistic practice and culture, working and producing conditions, on the economy, on the socio-political and cultural environment, and other institutional structures that influence the performing arts field.

Curating is to be an activistic practice, a tactic to enable the visibility of performing arts diversities, heterogeneities, where the curatorial practice and the curators of performing arts can be “mediators”, drawing lines of connection and transfers of aesthetic, social, political knowledge between: 1. the socio-political, economic, and cultural context, whereby performing arts are produced; 2. the institutional organization, scenes, ideologies, and structures, whereby performing arts subsist; 3. the performing arts practices; and, 4. their presentation and dissemination back in the socio-political, economic, and cultural context.

Curating is to be based on methodologies as a necessary knowledge for analysing and understanding both the socio-political and the hegemonic cultural practices and art institutions, on the one hand, and the performing arts practices and audience reception, on the other hand, in the specific contexts and their rhizomatic relations.

The curating institution can be seen as a potential to enable artistic work to become part of the public, and to directly influence the reconfiguration of the public sphere in culture, either by critically situating and setting performing arts practices in the various public spaces already marked by hegemonic political organization and marked by distribution of power vectors, or by critically situating and setting performing arts practices in newly established public spaces (that we need to advocate for and insist on), and by analysing, deconstructing, and reconfiguring the dominant and unjust social choreographies through the very means available and specific to performing arts, and their distribution to wider social audiences and publics. The curating performing arts institution is inclusive, and an opportunity for overcoming the isolation of the different experiments or aesthetics and critical knowledge production sites in society, by establishing connections and dialogue between civil society advocacy groups and organizations, art and cultural practices, and performing artists and choreographers.

Such approaches are empirically visible through Kino Kultura, a newly established project space for contemporary performing arts and culture that, in its logic, is based on a hybrid institutional model which experiments with the possible rhizomatic method of governing. Kino Kultura is a desire for an autonomous space for contemporary performing arts and culture that does not marginalize, or exclude forms of arts, or media, but includes traditional, drama theatre, with experimental theatre, contemporary dance, or performance. It synthesizes the curated programs with co-curated programs, with programs that are enhancing the processes of work in the contemporary arts in its specificities, but also opening a possibility

for contemporary performing arts to be social agents by allowing a larger civil society content to be visible and present. Therefore, it has a specific governing model, which I see as rhizomatic and which includes several bodies that communicate, redistribute power, and try to imagine how they will progress in the decision-making without compromising the essence of the space - institution – the artistic or cultural public content as the main resource. It is a private space that two organizations started renting (one is a NGO and the other is a private theatre company), and where additional partners are joining and forming programs for the community and civil society. It has "two bodies" that create two programs, and another "body" that is responsible for another program, "one body" of the space owners, "one" local public governance that supports part of its infrastructural issues, or many "interrelated bodies" of governance. Thus, it is a set of *private, public, and civil bodies* - in its diverse legal forms - that aim to refigure the meaning of the public space in culture and attribute to the reformation of the already endangered or compromised public sphere.

Kino Kultura was an agent for social and political transformations in the case in Macedonia where the independent culture, or the larger civil society was being excluded by the hegemonic political power vectors which were directing the local (public) institutions, or systematically restricted the possibility of use, and thus, restricted the visibility of socially and aesthetically relevant themes and issues. That made us, the cultural workers, or artists, curators, and cultural producers think in terms of promoting art as an agency of social and political change – in Suzana Milevska's words. Or, we/they became agents of change. They became a mediating machine producing self-governed models of public spaces, networking, shifting through activities, collaborations, presentations, conditions of work, and other. In becoming an agent of change, you strive for an environment where these changes can be produced. There can be other heterogenic approaches, which should not be multiplied, but

contextually specific, having diversified approaches sharing the ideological and value vectors.

Kino Kultura is just a small attempt to have a shared space, where we will have better working conditions, better possibilities to do.

Therefore, what should constitute a space/institution as an agent of societal and political transformations, or production of a sociality and self-parreshia? What should constitute the post-managerial paradigm and post-modern institution? These questions are answered through the thesis, and sublimated in this chapter.

> *Institution is a social structure, or economic and material manifestation of a certain ideology, and values that constitute it. It is a means and an aim. Institutionalisation of art doesn't imply only location in physical format, but conceptual and perceptual frames, i.e. discourses and praxes that recognize something and consume something as art. Institution of art is not, just space for production, distribution and reception of art, but also an entire field of art as a societal world.*
>
> *Therefore, the institution needs to create the conditions for a production of discourses and praxes based on certain values, and in relation to the context.*
>
> *Processes of self-reflection, as well as the reflection and critique coming from external sources need to be nurtured, since that is one of the aspects of evaluation of the work which can bring it closer to the society. What is important is to create a visibility for the achievements that are going beyond numbers. Therefore, running or forming an institution has to be approached from a self-critical position as a precondition of the institutional development on all levels.*
>
> *Closed institutions want to prevent their power position, and not to redistribute it towards the artistic, professional community, users, and public.*

Institution is a space for accumulation of audiences, a space that creates visibility of art works that are affected by the contextual frame in which works are produced and performed (the institutional vision and value). Space not as infrastructure only, but space as an environment held and nurtured by the principles of work which support the values on which the institution is formed.

Institutions need to have a clear vision, which shouldn't be shifted according to political or economic demands. Why are you making the institution – as a reason - not forgetting the reason behind, building the ethics of it, as the base of the work of the institution, as a relevant factor of its forming and responsibility towards the public, the community. Institution, as a place of common, where arts and culture are a resource.

The working system of the institution, or the rhizomatic approach as proposed, has to contribute to the formation of a communication structure that would enhance dialogue and relations in their potentiality, or as long-term partnership. The working system has to include the possibility for an internal and external evaluation. Internal evaluation based on self-reflection and self-critique as open and transparent. Transparency is a professional ethics, related to the responsibility towards the use of the public resources. The system of functioning of the institution has to be transparent and evaluated. Principles that would support openness and transparency have to be developed, and consequently, they will help the development of the institution as inclusive and open towards different communities.

Institution has a responsibility for creating the sustainable environment, for dance is in the institutions, but also the artists' community, other professionals in the field, as well as policy makers, and the educational system.

Alliances with public administrators, decision makers and the artistic sector, as well as other sectors – education, other art forms, humanities, and also within the dance sector, are mandatory since they are positions through which the ownership and power can be redistributed, and allow the dispersion of the content and results.

Communication externally presupposes the development of the strategies of communication with the policy makers, as well as other fields, as well as strategies of partnership and alliances needed with the other sectors such as education, other art forms, humanities, as well as within the different forms of dance.

The institution has to have a developmental role for the artistic community - needs to address the education, artistic research, and production conditions.

Institution has to be based on theoretical approaches/reflections on curating and methods of programming and program developing. Institution has to provide production conditions and be a system that can run without a central managerial power, or on bases of shared leadership. Institutions are creating the sustainability and they have to be open towards the scene and artists.

Institutions need to balance the history and the presence in content, in aesthetics and in support of artists; need to communicate with the surrounding, the environment; the institutions have lost the alliances with the artists, and therefore, this has to be addressed.

It needs to be stable in order to produce reference, in order to create open space and flexibility.

Leadership has to be self-critical and engage different perspectives that are affecting it or inducing a direction. All perspectives need to be taken into account - artist, manager, decision maker, curator, and artistic director.[84]

And, to conclude, I am relating this work to the statement made by Sabina Sabolović, a curator from WHW Zagreb whose presentation I attended some months ago in Skopje. I borrow the concept of what she talked about, or proposed as a perspective, which is - through the work of Mladen Stilinović – seminal work - "Everything we see could also be otherwise (My sweet little lamb)".

I agree, everything we see can always be otherwise, and I think the future is in the diversity of perspectives, and their opening. The perspective viewed through this thesis is one of the theoretically supported approaches, maps of thoughts and experiences. There can be other, and many views, or methodological potential approaches in thinking about the institutions in culture, and in performing arts - dance, performance, and choreography.

We need this in the academic world, but also in the everyday work in the field, to keep trying to develop theories, imagining, thinking, curating, governing, establishing spaces for arts, performing arts, failing and succeeding, but never giving up in the attempt to change and create a better environment in which we create and work in arts and culture.

[84] This quote contains parts from the report the author did after the workshop she lead together with Gisela Muller as part of the event Nomad Dance Advocates Sofia, 2015, http://nomaddanceinstitute.tumblr.com/advocacy

8. Bibliography

Agamben, G., 2000. *Means without ends: Notes on politics.* Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Alesina, A. and Giuliano, P., 2014. Culture and Institutions. Available at: <https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/alesina/files/cultureandinstitutions_jel_2014.pdf> [Accessed 15 January 2017].

Althusser, L., 1970. Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays,* Monthly Review Press 1971. Available at: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm> [Accessed 20 April 2017].

Apasiev, D., 2012. Како НВО-секторот во Македонија го задуши граѓанскиот активизам. *Радио Слободна Европа,* [online] Available at: <https://www.slobodnaevropa.mk/a/24502544.html> [Accessed 17 May 2014].

Archias, E., 2016. *The concrete body: Yvonne Rainer, Carolee Schneemann, Vito Acconci.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Arnstein, S. R., [1969] 2004. A ladder of citizen participation. *JAIP*, 35(4), pp. 216-224. Available at: <http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html> [Accessed 10 September 2017].

Banes, S., 1980. *Terpsichore in sneakers: Post-modern dance.* Middletown, Wesleyan: University Press.

Benjamin, W., 1968. *Illuminations.* Translated by K. Josifoska., 2010. Skopje: ILI-ILI.

Bogavac, M., 2009. Ex- theatre in Serbia: Alternative has no Alternativa. *Raster 2008*, TkH: Belgrade.

Bourdieu, P., 1984. *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Brandstetter, G. and Klein, G. eds., 2013. Dance and theory. Bielefeld: transcript.

Buden, B., 2006. *Translation is impossible. Let's do it!.* [online] EIPCP. Available at: <http://eipcp.net/transversal/1206/buden/en/#_ftn5> [Accessed 20 December 2017].

Carlson, M., 2009 [1996]. *Performance: A critical introduction*. London: Routledge.

Chavance, B., 2012. John Commons's organizational theory of institutions: a discussion. *Journal of Institutional Economics,* 8(1), pp.27-47.

Copeland, R., 1983. Beyond expressionism: Merce Cunningham's critique of "the natural". In: J. Adshead-Lansdale and J. Layson, eds. 1983. *Dance history: An introduction.* London and New York: Routledge. pp.182-198.

Cvejić, B., Marković, T., Matić, Lj., Mirković, M., Šuvaković, M. and Vujanović, A., 2002. Fragmentarne istorije plesa u XX i početkom XXI veka: Diskursi, poze i transgresije plesa. *TkH, časopis za teoriju izvođačkih umetnosti,* 4. Beograd: TkH-centar za teoriju i praksu izvođačkih umetnosti.

Cvetičanin, P., 2009. Vaninstitucionalni akteri kulturne politike u Srbiji, Crnoj Gori i Makedoniji. *Centar za empirijske studije kulture jugoistočne Evrope, Niš.* Available at: <http://www.expeditio.org/images/stories/downloads/Vaninstitucionalni_akteri_kulturne_politike.pdf> [Accessed 20 May 2011].

Cvetičanin, P., 2014. Polje kulturne produkcije u Srbiji. CESK working papers. *Časopis za kulturu nevladinih organizacija Vojvodine, "Most",* Zavod za kulturu Vojvodine, 2, pp.15-56.

Ćirić, M., 2012. *Kustoske prakse i institucionalna kritika.* Univerzitet umetnosti u Beogradu, Interdisciplinarne studije, Teorija umetnosti I medija.

Čopić, V., 2011. *Open institutions, institutional imagination and cultural public sphere*. Zagreb: Alliance Operation City.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F., 2004. *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia.* London: Continuum.

Dimitrov, S. and Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, B., 2017. The "other" body: Mapping the archives of choreographic practices in Macedonia (1970-1990). *Maska – Journal for Performing Arts,* 31, pp.9-44.

Dragićević Šešić, M., 2006. Shared policies: The future of cultural development – new models of partnership between the public, private and civil sectors. In: B. Cvjetičanin, ed. 2006. *Dynamics of communication: New ways and new actors.* Zagreb: Institute for International Relations. pp. 103-111.

Dragićević Šešić, M. and Dragojević, S., 2005. *Arts management in turbulent times: Adaptable quality management.* Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation, Boekmanstudies.

Dragićević Šešić, M. and Dragojević, S., 2006. Imagined or real divides?. In: U. H. Meinhof and A. Triandafyllidou, eds. 2006. *Transcultural Europe: Cultural policy in a changing Europe.* London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 43-56.

Dragićević Šešić, M. and Drezgić, R., 2018. Methods of institutional agency in the public sphere: Cultural policy challenges and achievements. In: B. Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, N. Bodrožić and V. Kachakova, eds. 2018. *Modelling public space(s) in culture: Rethinking institutional practices in culture and historical (dis)continuities.* Skopje: Lokomotiva – Centre for new Initiatives in arts and culture. pp. 42-62.

Dragićević Šešić, M. and Şuteu, C., 2005. Challenges of cultural cooperation in Southeastern Europe: The internationalization of cultural policies and practices. In. N. Švob-Đokić, ed. 2005. *The emerging creative industries in Souheastern Europe.* Zagreb: Institute for International Relations.

Fischer-Lichte, E., 2008. *The transformative power of performance: A new aesthetic.* London and New York: Routledge.

Fischer-Lichte, E., 2014. *Theatre and performance studies.* London and New York: Routledge.

Foster, S. L., 1986. *Reading dancing: Bodies and subjects in contemporary American dance.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Foucault, M., 1967. *Of other spaces*. [online] Heterotopia. Available at: <https://foucault.info/documents/heterotopia/foucault.heteroTopia.en/> [Accessed 7 December 2012].

George-Graves, N., 2015. Magnetic fields: Too dance for theater, too theater for dance. In: N. George-Graves, ed. 2015. *The Oxford handbook on theater and dance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Georgiev, Z., 2013. *Cinema "Kultura".* [online] Okno.mk. Available at: <https://okno.mk/node/30692> [Accessed 15 September 2016].

Geshoska, I. and Chalovski, Y., 2018. More than a model: The story (so far) of the socio-cultural space centre - JADRO in Skopje. In: B. Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, N. Bodrožić and V. Kachakova, eds. 2018. *Modelling public space(s) in culture: Rethinking institutional practices in culture and historical (dis)continuities.* Skopje: Lokomotiva – Centre for new Initiatives in arts and culture. pp. 94-103.

Gielen, P. ed., 2013. *Institutional attitudes – Instituting art in a flat world.* Amsterdam: Antennae Valiz.

Gielen, P., 2009. *The murmuring of the artistic multitude, global art, memory and post-fordisam.* Amsterdam: Antennae Valiz.

Grlja, D. and Vesić, J., 2007. *The neoliberal institution of culture and the critique of culturalization.* [online] EIPCP. Available at: <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0208/prelom/en> [Accessed 5 May 2018].

Habermas, J., 1962. *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991.

Hagoort, G., 2003. *Art management, entrepreneurial style.* Delft: Eburon Publishers.

Hasitschka, W., Tschmuck, P. and Zembylas, T., 2005. Cultural institutions studies: Investigating the transformation of cultural goods. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society,* 35(2), pp.147-158.

Hatch, M. J. and Cunliffe, A. L., 2006. *Organization theory, modern, symbolic and postmodern perspectives.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hirsch, N., Miessen, M., Misselwitz, P. and Görlich, M., 2006. Under construction: Perspectives of institutional practice, spaces of production. In: V. Joan Müller and N. Schafhausen, eds. 2006. *Under construction. On institutional practice.* Cologne: Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther König.

Jovicevic, A. and Vujanović, A., 2006. *Uvod u studije performansa*. Beograd: Edicija Rec.

Kangas, A. and Vestheim, G., 2010. Institutionalism, cultural institutions and cultural policy in the Nordic countries. *Högskolan I Boräs, Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidskrift,* 13(02), pp.267-286. Available at: <https://www.idunn.no/nkt/2010/02/art03> [Accessed 12 February 2017].

Katunarić, V., 2004. Toward the new public culture. In: N. Švob-Đokić, ed. 2004. *Cultural transitions in Southeastern Europe.* Zagreb: Institute for International Relations. pp. 19-42.

Katunarić, V., 2005. New public culture as objective of the decentralization process. In: H. Weeda, C. Şuteu and C. Smithuijsen, eds. 2005. *The arts, politics and change:*

Participative cultural policy-making in South East Europe. Amsterdam: Boekmanstudies.

Klaić, D., 2012. *Resetting the stage: Public theatre between the market and democracy.* Bristol: Intellect.

Krupp, K., 2015. *Kulturhaushalt Berlins freie szene wird gestärkt.* [online] Berliner Zeitung. Available at: <https://www.berliner-zeitung.de/kultur/kulturhaushalt-berlins-freie-szene-wird-gestaerkt-22490894> [Accessed 8 July 2015].

Kunst, B., 3 July 2015. Economies of performance, *MA SODA Micro-series.* HZT Uferstudio 8, unpublished.

Kunst, B., 2017. *The institutionalisation, precarity and the rhythm of work.* [online] Kunstenpunkt. Available at: <https://www.kunsten.be/dossiers/perspectief-kunstenaar/perspective-institution/4450-the-institutionalisation-precarity-and-the-rhythm-of-work> [Accessed 20 April 2017].

Lehmann, H., 2006. *Postdramatic theatre.* London and New York: Routledge.

Lepecki, A., 2006. *Exhausting dance, performance and the politics of movement.* London:Routledge.

Lorey, I., 2013. On democracy and occupation: Horizontality and the need for new forms of verticality. In. P. Gielen, ed. 2013. *Institutional attitudes – Instituting art in a flat world.* Amsterdam: Antenae Valiz. pp. 78-99.

Marusic, S. J., 2015. *Skopje 2014: The new face of Macedonia, updated.* [online] Balkan Insight. Available at: <http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/gallery/skopje-2014> [Accessed 15 August 2015].

McGuigan, J., 1996. *Culture and the public sphere.* London: Routledge.

Meadows, D. H., 2008. *Thinking in systems: A primer.* Vermont: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Milevska, S., 2007. *Internalisation of the discourse of institutional critique and its unhappy consciousness.* [online] EIPCP. Available at: <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0208/milevska/en> [Accessed 30 June 2013].

Milevska, S., 2011. Curating as an agency of cultural and geopolitical change. In: *Towards curating as a critical practice.* Workshop Reader, Novi Sad, Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina 27 – 29. pp. 22-26.

Ministry of Culture of R. Macedonia, 2013. *National strategy for cultural development of R. Macedonia 2013-2017.* [pdf] Skopje. Available at: <http://www.kultura.gov.mk/index.php/legislativa/60-2013-02-27-10-20-24/840-nacionalna-strategija-za-razvoj> [Accessed 2 June 2018].

Ministry of Culture of R. Macedonia, 2018. *National strategy for cultural development of R. Macedonia 2018-2022.* [pdf] Skopje. Available at: <http://www.kultura.gov.mk/index.php/legislativa/60-2013-02-27-10-20-24/3949-nacionalona-strategija-za-razvoj-na-kulturata-vo-republika-makedonija-vo-periodot-2018-2022> [Accessed 2 June 2018].

Mišković, D., 2015. Kontekst kao sadržaj. In: Radna bilježnica za društveno-kulturne centre, 2015. *Prema intitucionalnom pluralizmu: Razvoj društveno-kulturnih centara.* Zagreb: Radni skup. pp. 5-18.

Mouffe, C., 2013. Institutions as sites of agonistic intervention. In: P. Gielen, ed. 2013. *Institutional attitudes – Instituting art in a flat world.* Amsterdam: Antenae Valiz. pp. 66-77.

Möntmann, N., 2007. *The rise and fall of new institutionalism: Perspectives on a possible future.* [online] EIPCP. Available at: <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0407/moentmann/en> [Accessed 5 June 2012].

Möntmann, N., 12 November 2008. Kako pripadati svojoj umjetničkoj instituciji. G-MK | Galerija Miroslav Kraljević, unpublished.

Murphy, M., 2015. Fleshing out: Physical theatre, postmodern dance, and som [e] agency. In: N. George-Graves, ed. 2015. *The Oxford handbook on theatre and dance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 125-148.

Murray, S. and Keefe, J., 2007. *Physical theatres: A critical introduction.* London and New York: Routledge.

Nikodinovski-Bish, Lj., 2009. *Alternativniot teatar vo Makedonija*. Skopje: Magor.

Ozimec, K., 2017. *„Шарена револуција“ – прв чекор кон промена на граѓанската свест.* [onine] Deutsche Welle. Available at: <www.dw.com/mk/шарена-револуција-прв-чекор-кон-промена-на-граѓанската-свест/a-36929675> [Accessed 23 April 2017].

Ožegović, N., 2017. *Dosta je samovolje, prije izbora želimo samostalnu ustanovu za ples.* [online] Tportal. Available at: <https://www.tportal.hr/kultura/clanak/dosta-je-samovolje-prije-izbora-zelimo-samostalnu-ustanovu-za-ples> [Accessed 1 June 2017].

Paffenholz, T. and Spurk, C., 2006. *Social development papers: Conflict prevention & reconstruction.* [pdf] Washington, DC: World Bank. Available at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCPR/Resources/WP36_web.pdf> [Accessed 25 January 2014].

Petkovska, N., 2012. Театарска поетика на алтернативните театри во Македонија и во Словенија во 60-тите и 70-тите годинин на дваесеттиот век. [online] Center za Slovenšćino kot Drugi in Tuji Jezik. Available at: <http://www.centerslo.net/files/file/simpozij/simp%2031/zbornik/Petkovska.pdf> [Accessed 23 June 2018].

Powell, F., 2007. *The politics of civil society: Neoliberalism or social left?*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Pristaš, G. S., Hrvatin, E. and Kunst, B., 2007. East Dance Academy. *Maska – Journal for Performing Arts,* 103/104, Ljubljana.

Prnjat, D., 2018. Civil/Public partnerships in the Balkan Ravines: Macedonian scenario. In: B. Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, N. Bodrožić and V. Kachakova, eds. 2018. *Modelling public space(s) in culture: Rethinking institutional practices in culture and historical (dis)continuities.* Skopje: Lokomotiva – Centre for new Initiatives in arts and culture. pp. 42-62.

Ramsay, B., 2006. *Judson dance theatre: Performative traces.* London and New York: Routledge.

Randy, M., 1998. *Critical moves: Dance studies in theory and practice.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Raunig, G., 2004. *The double criticism of parrhesia. Answering the question "What is a progressive (art) institution?".* [online] Republicart EIPCP. Available at: <http://www.republicart.net/disc/institution/raunig04_en.htm> [Accessed 15 September 2016].

Raunig, G. and Ray, G. eds., 2009. *Art and contemporary critical practices: Reinventing institutional critique.* London: MayFly Books.

Raunig, G., 2011. Inventing condividuality: An escape route from the pitfalls of community and collectivity In: A. Vujanović and A. Milohnić, eds. *The Politicality Of Performance*, pp. 142-146, *TkH journal 19*. TkH & Les Laboratoires d'Aubervilliers.

Rogoff, I., 2006. WE: Collectivities, mutualities, participations. In: *Curatorial Translation* (London: Goldsmiths College, London University).

Schechner, R., 2002. *Performance studies: An introduction.* London and New York: Routledge.

Schechner, R., 2003. *Performance theory.* London and New York: Routledge.

Sheikh, S., 2006. *Notes on institutional critique.* [online] EIPCP. Available at: <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0106/sheikh/en> [Accessed 15 February 2017].

Sheikh, S., 2011. *Instituting the institution,* in Open institutions, institutional imagination and cultural public sphere. Zagreb: Alliance Operation City.

Shepherd, S., 2006. *Theatre, body, and pleasure*. London and New York: Routledge.

Simjanovska, V., 2013. *Possible new model of cultural policy of the Republic of Macedonia in multicultural context*. Ph.D. University of Arts in Belgrade.

Spangberg, M., 2014. *Critical correspondence: Dance and the museum: Marten Spangberg responds.* [online] Movement Research. Available at: <https://movementresearch.org/publications/critical-correspondence/dance-and-the-museum-marten-spangberg-responds> [Accessed, 7 August 2016].

Staines, J., 2009. *Performing arts policy and funding in Europe.* [online] ASEF CULTURE30. Available at: <https://culture360.asef.org/resources/performing-arts-policy-and-funding-europe#sthash.NJwj8QyO.dpuf> [Accessed 10 July 2015].

Stardelov, G., Luzhina, J. and Dzeparoski, I. (editorial board), 2004. *Theatre on the Macedonian Soil XX* century: 335-375. Skopje: MANU.

Šuvaković, M., 2010. *Method, format, strategy, tactics, practice, procedure, protocol, platform and other exam questions for the professor.* [online] Anti-Jargon. Available at: <http://www.antijargon.tkh-generator.net/2010/06/09/suvakovicen/> [Accessed 14 October 2016].

Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, B. ed., 2010. Iskra Šukarova. *TkH, časopis za teoriju izvođačkih umetnosti,* 18. Beograd: TkH-centar za teoriju i praksu izvođačkih umetnosti.

Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, B. with Založnik, J., 2012. *Cultural policy research: Contemporary dance in Slovenia – policies and actors.* [online] Nomad Dance Academy. Available at: <http://www.nomaddanceacademy.org/files/files/Slovenia_CP%20analyses.pdf> [Accessed 30 September 2012].

Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, B., Veljanovska, E. and Vaseva, I., 2013. The festival as a "Microphysics of Power" (Foucault)". In: B. Cvejić and G. S. Pristaš, eds. 2013. *Parallel slalom, a lexicon of non-aligned poetics.* Walking Theory – TkH, Belgrade and CDU – Centre for Drama Arts, Zagreb.

Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, B. and Zdravkova-Dzeparoska, S., 2014. *Една историска конструкција за развој на современата танцова смена во Македонија.* [online] Mediantrop. Available at: <http://www.mediantrop.rankomunitic.org/dn-is-ris-ns-ru-ci> [Accessed 20 December 2014].

Toevski, S., 2015. *Театарот – полигон за пресметка со неистомислениците?*. [Online] Deutsche Welle. Available at: <www.dw.com/mk/театарот-полигон-за-пресметка-со-неистомислениците/a-18606979> [Accessed 25 July 2015].

Valencia, M., 2017. Critical correspondence: *Nomad Dance Advocates in Belgrade: A GPS/Global practice sharing meeting.* [online] Movement Research. Available at: <https://movementresearch.org/publications/critical-correspondence/nomad-dance-advocates-in-belgrade-2017> [Accessed 20 January 2018].

Varbanova, L., 2013. *Strategic management in the arts.* London: Routledge.

Vidović, D., 2015. Priručnik: Uradi sam – DKC. In: *Radna bilježnica za društveno-kulturne centre,* 2015. *Prema institucionalnom pluralizmu: Razvoj društveno-kulturnih centara.* Zagreb: Radni skup. pp. 61-74.

Vilenica, A., 2006. Self-organisation in a labyrinth between artistic practice and theory. *Walking Theory -TkH Magazine,* 11. Belgrade.

Vilić, N., 2013. Симбиотичката уметност како производ на кризата. [online] *Критика I (2).* Available at: <https://kritickamisla.wordpress.com/> [Accessed 25 April 2014].

Višnjić, E. and Dragojević, S. eds., 2008. *A Bottom Up Approach to Cultural Policy Making*. Zagreb: Policies for Culture.

Vujanović, A., 2004. *Razarajući označitelji/e performansa: Prilog zasnivanju pozno poststrukturalističke materijalističke teorije izvođačkih umetnosti.* Beograd: SKC.

Vujanović, A., 2006. Self-organization: Notes on the subject-matter of the conference. *TkH, Journal for Performing Arts Theory: Self-organization issue,* Belgrade.

Vujanović, A., 2007. Not quite – not right Eastern Western dance (On the contemporary dance scene in Serbia). *Raster,* 1, Belgrade.

Vujanović, A. and Cvejić, B., 2012. *Public sphere by performance.* Belgrade: B_Books.

Vujanović, A., 2015. The magic of artworlds (Three scenes from Belgrade). Performance research, On Institutions, 30-38.

Zdravkova-Dzeparoska, S., 2005. Multimedia dance genres. In: G. Stardelov, J. Luzhina and I. Dzeparoski (editorial board). *Theatre on the Macedonian soil XX century:* 335-375. Skopje: MANU.

Zdravkova-Dzeparoska, S., 2005. Formation and development of the contemporary dance theatre. In: G. Stardelov, J. Luzhina and I. Dzeparoski (editorial board). *Theatre on the Macedonian soil XX century:* 335-375. Skopje: MANU.

Žuvela, A., 2015. Kulturna politika I mjesta kulturnog stvaralaštva – startne pozicije. In: Radna bilježnica za društveno-kulturne centre, 2015. *Prema intitucionalnom pluralizmu: Razvoj društveno-kulturnih centara.* Zagreb: Radni skup. pp. 19-60.

Žuvela, A., 2018. Exploring practices of participatory cultural governance as tendencies in local cultural development. In: B. Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, N. Bodrožić and V. Kachakova, eds. 2018. *Modelling public space(s) in culture: Rethinking institutional practices in culture and historical (dis)continuities.* Skopje: Lokomotiva – Centre for new Initiatives in arts and culture. pp. 64-85.

Appendix I

Case Study

Kino Kultura – Space for contemporary performing art and contemporary culture [85]

Introduction

KINO KULTURA is a privately owned building, nowadays operated as a public space for contemporary performing arts and culture, with a significant collective memory and history in the cultural and urban map of Skopje.

KINO KULTURA, an old cinema structure, is located in the centre of Skopje, on the main pedestrian street (Macedonia), 3 Luj Paster Street no.3.

Fragmented information related to Kino Kultura's foundation, programs, and significance to Skopje cultural life is available in non-related research, however, not in other thematic texts with an in-depth analysis on the existence and development of this architectural and cultural site and space.

Due to very little information that would depict the trajectory of the historical development of KINO KULTURA as a space and cultural site, during the research we took the opportunity to assess different information we have come across in interviews and other materials. We conducted interviews with Mrs. Viktorija Kostova Volchkova, an architect and daughter of

[85] This text is part of the research carried out by the author of this thesis and her colleague Violeta Kachakova, of which a version is published under the title Kino Kultura – project space for contemporary performing arts and contemporary culture, In: B. Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski, N. Bodrožić and V. Kachakova, eds. 2018. *Modelling public space(s) in culture: Rethinking institutional practices in culture and historical (dis)continuities.* Skopje: Lokomotiva – Centre for new Initiatives in arts and culture.

one of the building founders, as well as with Mr. Aco Dukovski, who was long-term manager of the Skopje cinema theatres network Gradski Kina[86] of which Kino Kultura was part.

In one of the texts published on the Okno internet portal, the journalist Zvezdan Georgiev (2013) talks about cinema "Kultura" and the effects of its devastation in present day. He explains that one of the most beautiful Skopje buildings has nowadays been totally ruined. In his description he conveys memories of the building's importance, its surrounding and the related cultural life:

> It is not, therefore, only a cheap metaphor when one says that with the collapse of Kino Kultura began the collapse of Macedonian culture. Because, if anything ever rightly owned its name, it was cinema "Kultura", a one-of-a-kind university of film, and through it, a university of life in general. (Georgiev, 2013)

In the text, Georgiev (2013) attributes to the building the significance of a cultural monument with an important impact on the socio-cultural life and urban development.

This space has been performing its public function for decades, failing to transform according to the conditions and the needs dictated by the transition period, i.e. the reform of the market, the institutions, and their roles in the country. New technologies emerged, as well as the accessibility of the film art through video stores, which changed the focus of the audience. The denationalization process restored the building in the property of private individuals or the successors of the founders, who had no interest in continuing its public and cultural function.

Zvezdan Georgiev (2013) refers to Kino Kultura as "a monument of culture" – and relates it to numerous events in the past. One is related to the setting of the first public drama theatre

[86] According to the website of the Cinematheque of Macedonia: January 17, 1948 - The City Council of Skopje establishes a company for film showing "Gradski Kina – Skopje (City Cinema-Skopje)", http://www.macedonianlife.com/article.aspx?artid=00320033-0041-0031-3000-460046004600

performance of the future Macedonian National Theatre, in Macedonian language, staged on 20th December 1944 in cinema Uranija (later renamed in Kino Kultura). The performance was the one-act play directed by Dimitar Kjostarov[87].

The Creation of Kino Kultura – History

Kino Kultura is the only cinema-theatre building to survive through the historic deserts, socio-political, economic, and cultural transformations, a living monument or structure of Skopje cultural life since 1973.

The first construction projects for the building known as Kino Kultura (according to the documentation from the Archive of the City of Skopje) originated in 1933. There are assumptions that this is maybe the first building in Skopje planned and designed since day one as a cinema, named in the project documentation as "cinema-theatre".

A document confirms that in 1933, the enterprise "Jovan and Nikifor Kostic" submitted a request to start a procedure for obtaining a construction licence for a building designed to be a "cinema-theatre" on the parcel owned by the owners of the said enterprise, today on Luj Paster Street, number 3.

After the death of Jovan Kostic, his sons inherited the business as full owners[88]. In some publicly available information, the name of Filota Nichota appears as the owner, although he was a founding partner of the enterprise in 1936, and managed other projects. In 1938, the collaboration was terminated and he was compensated for all joint investments.

[87] This information can also be found on the website of the Theatre Institute of Macedonia http://www.mactheatre.edu.mk/main/timeline_mac.html

[88] Jovan Kostic in 1923/24 launched a retail sale business. Around 1930, Jovan involved his brother, Nikifor Kostic, in the business. As of this moment the firm is managed under the name "Jovan and Nikifor Kostic".

The enterprise dealt with wholesale and had numerous activities, the construction of the cinema being one of them. In 1941, the firm "Jovan and Nikifor Kostic" ceased to exist. During the subsequent war period the building was managed by the common firm of the Kostovi (Kostic) brothers, registered under the name "Urania".

The first building project was designed by the Russian architect Ivan Artemushkin in 1933, at the same time when the construction licence was requested. In 1936, the entire documentation was completed, i.e. it was elaborated according to the applicable legislation, standards and regulations. The harmonization with the urban development plan, along with the regulation and construction lines, was completed, and a construction licence was obtained. The project according to which the building was constructed is signed by the architect Kiril Zernovski, who is also a contractor of the building. The construction began on 1st September 1936, and the building was completed on 15th February 1937.

The official inauguration happened on 1st March 1937, when the building was opened and put in function under the name "Urania". From 1937 to 1945, the building Kino Kultura was managed as a part of the family business and was the pride of the firm and the family.

The building is a solid construction, a combination of bearing walls of full bricks and reinforced concrete pillars. The mezzanine constructions are reinforced concrete ceilings. The damages made by the Skopje 1963 earthquake[89] were repaired with reinforced concrete lanes that fortified the massive walls bearing the ceiling construction of the rooms in the basement and the lobby, and the building was seismically stabilized, according to the applicable legislation.

According to the architect Viktorija Kostova Velichkova, the building style can be considered as neo-classicism, although it remains a subject for discussion because it can also be interpreted as a modest form of the international style originating in the 1930s, further

[89] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1963_Skopje_earthquake

developed in architecture cleared of decorative details, focusing on form and composition. Its façade has remained to this day unchanged. What also remains unchanged is the functional side of the central space in the building, which from the very beginning was conceived as a theatre with an entry hall and two gallery halls on the floors, linked to the stair cores placed on both sides. This space is used today as a cinema, but has been reconstructed in order to be used as a theatre space above all, but also to respond to the needs of different cultural contents, i.e. has been adapted in order to be multifunctional.

In his text, Zvezdan Georgiev comments on the initial technological furnishings and the repertory:

> The most recent cinema-operator equipment (the German film camera "Ermenand 2") was purchased supposedly for 80 golden Napoleons. The equipment was installed by two professionals from Austria. Anyways, despite the competition, the cinema, given its modernity, became instant attraction, and before every projection a brass orchestra would play in front of the cinema while the audience stood under the "luxes" (gas lights), listening to a conferencier reading the content of the film. The films were licensed and acquired from the most prominent film production and distribution companies like "Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer", "Ufa", "Paramount", and "20th Century Fox". (Georgiev, 2013)

In 1939, Kino Kultura signed a contract with Avala Film Belgrade for the distribution of films projected at the time in Cinema Urania. During the war period, the basement space was not functional, whereas the theatre remained active. There are documents confirming active repertory and film projection in 1939. The film program of the cinema in this period was characterized as being of a propaganda character, that is, the cinema operated under severely defined rules and, in occupation conditions. Films could only be acquired from Sofia. A contract was signed for a package of films containing one or two films interesting for the

audience, and seven, eight or nine propaganda films the cinema was obliged to project a certain number of times during the period indicated in the contract. The owners were not allowed to close the cinema, and had to maintain the business. The propaganda films were projected during the least attractive periods of the day – morning cinema or early in the afternoon. The Kostovi family was part of the young bourgeoisie of the pre-war Yugoslavia, therefore even in war conditions they abode by market terms, respecting the business logic and their family's survival needs.

According to archive sources, the building was declared, during this period, as a building of cultural importance for the development of a propaganda system on current activities.

With a decision of the central Yugoslav authorities at the time, cinemas were proclaimed monuments of culture with a particular importance for the new social order. As such, all cinemas in Macedonia, to the last one, were nationalized according to the same model: with an "accusation for collaboration with the enemy" they were extorted as "declarations of gift".

The building, obtained by the state, belonged to FIDIMA, whose director at the time was Blagoja Drnkov. In 1945, the building was given the name Kino Kultura, and it later became a part of the legal entity Gradski Kina, i.e. distributed according to the system of public enterprises as part of the state enterprise Gradski Kina[90], which run 18 cinema theatres in Skopje. This "state enterprise of particular social interest" had a Workers' Council composed of 24 people (out of whom 12 from the internal structure of Gradski Kina, and 12 representatives of state institutions, media, etc.). Twenty out of the total number were employed to work in Kino Kultura, according to Aco Dukovski[91].

[90] After the earthquake of 1963 the need to open cinema theaters in several subdivisions in Skopje was established. These cinema theaters were a part of the local communities, cultural homes (their entities were not legally regulated), up until 1990 when there remained only 4 central cinemas: Kino Vardar, Kino Kultura, Kino Manaki, and Kino Centar.

[91] Dukovski is director of Kino Kultura (then under Gradski Kina) from 1984/85 to 2003, when he resigned. Dukovski took over the building of Kino Kultura completely as part of Gradski Kina (and it keeps its name, Kino Kultura). The director before him was Kuzman Kuzmanovski.

Gradski Kina covered the overall cinema theatres' expenses solely from ticket sales, as a self-sustainable financial entity, without the participation of state or private funds (including the entire infrastructure maintenance of 18 cinema theatres, around 100 employees, overall film programme, etc.).

After 1990, Gradski Kina remained a public enterprise since it wasn't able to obtain a privatization licence.

Development and Functionality of the Building

Due to modification in the security system, the original project (1933) was changed in the evacuation exits, with two security doors added to the cinema theatre.

The rest of the changes were not functional but were related to the programme activities developed in certain periods in the building.

The building has undergone through several stages of functional renovation: after the Skopje 1963 earthquake, there was a stage of renovation which lasted during the 1960s and 1970s, and it is considered that until the 1980s the renovation stage was completed. The restoration of the building was completed by 1964/65 (according to the documentation of the construction company "Pelagonija" that also carried out the construction work.)

The building's basement was projected to be a night bar, according to Zernovski's project. It is possible that this function was maintained until the beginning of the war in 1941 although there is no documentation to establish the validity of such a claim. During the war it was only a basement, but there is no evidence as to how this part was used after the war up until the adaptation of the Bambi/Manaki cinema.

More precisely, from the 1960s, the functional and other interventions to the building were performed in the following order: several years before the 1963 earthquake there was a

conversion of the basement, adapting it into the children's cinema "Bambi". After the 1963 earthquake, construction interventions were made to restore the building. In the 1980s, the cinema theater "Bambi" was renamed to "Manaki", seizing to function as a children's cinema with the change of the programme content.

There was also an intervention on the second floor of the frontal part to the façade, while the office space was commercialized and converted into the coffee bar "Cinema". Later, the hall in front of the first gallery on the first floor was remodelled, creating the space for the pocket cinema "Paradiso".

In the eighties of the last century, the interior of the great hall of Kino Kultura was also redesigned, and the elegant retro design with boxes on the back wall of the ground floor, the seats at tables of marble, legs of wrought iron in the first gallery, and ceiling with hidden lights in a centrally located circular profilation modelled in plaster received a "modern" look with a rich colourful solution. Today this design still exists, still retro from today's perspective as well. Later the "Cinema" space was closed, and also part of the ground floor was rented for commercial activities (retail, café etc.).

In the initial idea for the building, the focus was on the social involvement of active viewers, i.e. its architecture was conceived to provide spaces for socialization of the audience. The initial object of Kino Kultura included two gallery spaces (under the current section called Cinema Paradiso), strictly for social cohesion of people, the audience, after the projection of the film content.

Therefore, it can be noted that at the time culture was understood as a cohesive factor, so the building was designed to achieve that function, i.e. in the cinema (Kino) Kultura the gallery spaces were built specifically designed for socialization. If compared with how the spaces of cinema theatres are organised today, or their location in the malls, we can immediately observe that the priority is to encourage consumerism.

Today, the building's spaces are the following:

1. MAIN CINEMA THEATER / KINO KULTURA – 330m2 plus two balconies 240m2
2. UNDERGROUND CINEMA / KINO MANAKI/BAMBI (or BASEMENT) - 280m2
3. POCKET CINEMA / PARADISO - 100m2 (space
4. Office on the first floor / 40m2
5. Office 2 on the second floor / 110 m2
6. Coffee bar space / approx. 60m2

Today

With the denationalization in 2007, the building was restored to the owners' successors, after being seized in 1945 by the state.

After its denationalization, the building was not used, i.e. wasn't rented again and remained empty. The owners sought ways to put it into function, but due to certain obstacles, it remained empty until 2015.

Lokomotiva, in partnership with the Theatre Navigator, both organizations working in the field of performing arts, had been searching a long time for a space for the realization of their activities. Among the many spaces we found, a number of them were private and some state-owned.

Having in mind that the opening of a space for contemporary performing arts, which was our organizations' idea, is of public importance, we asked for the support of the local and central authorities and failed to secure it.

In Kino Kultura we found the infrastructural suitability to perform our ideas. Moreover, for us it was also important that this space has significant history in the development of the socio-cultural life in the city.

We believed the space could respond to the ideas and needs not only of these organizations but also to the wider cultural community.

Kino Kultura became a new space for contemporary performing arts and culture in 2015, founded by Theatre Navigator Cvetko, a private theatre company and Lokomotiva - Centre for New Initiatives in Arts and Culture, a civil society or non-governmental organization.

Only part of the space is rented, managed according to an internal model of governing we are aiming to develop.

The politics of programming are based on mutually agreed program lines described further below.

Key questions on the model development of Kino Kultura

In order to even start deliberating on new approaches to governance and operational models, a certain set of basic questions has to be addressed. These pertain to detecting the adequate model of governance according to the standing state-of-art in a given cultural space. To be precise, every model of participatory governance has its own logic and it is unadvisable for models to be copied from one case to another as they are highly, if not entirely dependent on the context. The key questions are the following: Who are the involved actors?, How are responsibilities delegated between the actors?, What is the governing structure?, Who has the authority of decision-making?, How are the different actors included in the decision-making processes?, How are decision-making processes defined and regulated?, In what way is communication between different actors ensured and sustained?, Who are the owners of the

infrastructure?, Who is using the infrastructure?, What are the contractual conditions and relationships between the owners and users of the infrastructure?, What are the modes of using the infrastructure?, How many actors are directly and indirectly involved in using the infrastructure?, What are the internal rules and regulations on the usage of the infrastructure?, What is the typology of the infrastructure?, What is the main purpose behind the use of the infrastructure?, What are the modes of engaging the cultural and wider social community in the activities of the space?, What are the planning methods for developing the infrastructure towards enabling further programme development?, What are the safety aspects of the infrastructure usage?

How we think of Kino Kultura

The answers to the above listed questions, the background documents and the theoretical overview of the new models of governance were the guiding markers for devising the future centre for contemporary performing arts and contemporary culture, or alternating the existing one. The particular aim is to detect three levels of functioning: governance level; organisational level; and programming level. These three levels encompassed multitude of involved or prospective actors; from the owners of the infrastructure to the organisations renting/using the venue to the wider spectre of standing and prospective users (NGO organisations, private companies, individual artists etc.); local government and local community/the public – the audiences.

Moreover, our intention is to plan the expansion of Kino Kultura as a space - in the sense of spreading the activities to the entire infrastructural capacity of 1.160m2, rather than only the current ¼ of the capacity (330m2), but also is to think of Kino Kultura as a concept that doesn't need to be related only to this certain space.

However, in this study we reflect on the first scenario.

Legal/contractual aspect

Kino Kultura was initiated and developed by the *main partners and co-founders* Theatre Navigator Cvetko and Lokomotiva, as a non-existing but highly needed, public space for contemporary arts and culture, with the focus on the performance arts. After locating this space in 2015 in the Kino Kultura building, the main partners entered the negotiation process with *the building owners* (10 persons with different property share). The negotiations resulted in two subsequent rental arguments, from which the second one on 5 years, active until 2020. The rental agreement was signed between Theatre Navigator Cvetko and the building owners, which enables using part of the space (main scene, entering hall, first floor balcony and the office) for performing art and cultural programme. In order to enable equal partnership position in the governing, organisational and programme structure between the main partners, Theatre Navigator Cvetko signed an additional agreement with Lokomotiva for programme and management collaboration of Kino Kultura as a project space for contemporary performing arts and culture. The main partners decide on the organizational structure and delegation of the responsibilities. Through this structure, both legal entities are equally engaged in the realisation of the programme activities as well as fundraising that should enable the operational and programme substantiality. The main financial partner to support the idea and development of Kino Kultura was/and still is the Municipality of Centre[92]. Municipality support is received as a yearly project based grant to Theatre Navigator Cvetko. Each year the partner must apply to the municipality for the yearly funding, which doesn't guaranty the funding and the acquired amount per grant. Additionally, both partners work on enabling sufficient funds for maintaining the space through project based funding on national,

[92] http://opstinacentar.gov.mk/

regional and international level, donations, sponsorship and collaborations. Putting all this aspects in contractual relations in the realm of current legislation, we have performed contractual public-private partnership, which extends its practices to a specific *public-private-civil* partnership taking in consideration all Kino Kultura stakeholders – *main partners, space owners and the municipality*, with the potentiality of including other public and private actors as important stakeholders in the further development and suitability of Kino Kultura.

Operational aspect

The overall space and programme operation of Kino Kultura is performed by five persons, a team formed by representatives from the Theatre Navigator Cvetko and Lokomotiva. Hence, beside their current working positions within their main organization bases, the working obligations of Kino Kultura team members were extended to structural, running and operational maintaining of the space as well as management and coordination of the overall programme within. It is an unbalanced position since on the one side, half of the team is performing extra work on voluntary basis in order to maintain the space, and on the other, Kino Kultura requires a steady full time operational personnel to comply with the need for operational and programme sustainability of the space. In order to cover this operational gap, the current Kino Kultura team is overburdened with working responsible towards maintaining basic sustainability and existence of the space. In this context, positive changes are needed to enable new partnership relations in the realm of public – private – civil partnership. For that reason, the main partners are advocating for better support from public funds on national and local level, they are applying for infrastructural funds or requirements for donations that will

improve the space and technical capacities and are developing strategic partnerships, which besides the programme will also support the operational level of Kino Kultura.

Programme aspects (goals, instruments, analyses)

Kino Kultura is a unique space in regards to its structure and programme orientations. It is a space with a distinctive programme of contemporary art and culture content, with accent on the performing arts but also a content developed by the larger citizens' community, reflecting the recent and important questions in society. It is an open space freed of top-down decision-making, a space that provides freedom of speech, diversity and expression. Kino Kultura is an open space in which artists and cultural workers have the opportunity to develop and present contemporary concepts in the field of performing arts and wider. Their programmes involve many Macedonian and international partners, networks, projects, whose primarily aim is to review the models of collaboration between artists, theoreticians, critics, cultural workers, programmers of festival etc. Thereby, it opens possibilities for audience development as well as networking between related organizations, partners and beneficiaries of the programmes.

In the two years working as a space for contemporary performing arts and culture, Kino Kultura has become a positive example of a privately owned spaced, managed by private (non-profit) cultural actors, with a public function.

The basic programme frame of Kino Kultura is composed of 4 programme lines: *Theatre Navigator*, *Lokomotiva* [as programmes developed by the main partners related to performing arts (theatre, dance and performance], *Open space* (programme developed in collaboration with other organizations from the independent cultural scene and from the wider civil sector,

individuals and informal groups) and *Together* (animation and educational programme for creative development of the larger community).

The programme lines related to Theatre Navigator and Lokomotiva are curated, and Open Space and Together are lines opened to proposals and not regulated by a selection process or defined with aesthetic criteria or curatorial concept. Activities realised in Kino Kultura include theatre performances, performances in the field of contemporary dance and performance art, workshops for professionals and citizens, conferences, artistic researches, residences, educational programmes, different type of festivals, book promotions, concerts etc.

Aiming to test a possible aspect of participatory governing, as a base for further model development, the main partners developed the Advisory Body of Open Space. It is a temporary body composed of different representatives from independent culture and civil sector, with a mandate to develop a "Protocol for collaboration with the civil society in the frame of the Kino Kultura's programme line Open Scene". The members of the Advisory Body have different professional backgrounds and knowledge they can contribute in the process of development of the Open Scene protocol for collaboration. The Protocol comprises of two main types of collaborations: 1.Partnership collaboration - developing a space for critical reflection on social issues based on strategic long-term programme development that will support the operational - human, technical and financial aspect of the space; and 2.Collaboration with the wider community or users of the spaces; organisations dealing with culture and art, with socio-cultural themes and topics that concern the development of civil society, democracy and human rights and have an interest in supporting and having their programmes in the space where a critical reflection on social issues is being created. The protocol regulates the use of the line Open Scene in accordance with the available space, time and technical capacities. The protocol is a result of an open model of

cooperation and active participation of various actors from the civil society. The Protocol will enable a defined, transparent and democratic approach in the development of the Open Scene programmes, which will strengthen the established and create new long-term strategic partnerships and opportunities to develop activities with the wider civil society. The protocol is a result of a commune work relying on the principles of democracy, equity, solidarity, participation, respect for diversity, transparency, social responsibility and care for others.

***

Taking into consideration all three (legal, operational and programme) aspects in the frame of two years' working experience, we faced a situation where the main partners, responsible for the contractual and operational aspect in the scope of their activity, were becoming predominantly involved in facilitating the space for different productions rather than production of their own work. This situation has to be solved through a process that should enable the needed human capacities for full operation and implementation of the current and potential programme content. This can be done though better structural funding developed on the premises of partnership, joint working and taking care of the places of common interest which provide public content. Thus, Kino Kultura is open for development of bigger and stronger partnerships that will integrate the existing capacities in the scene. So, together they will work on creating relevant, dynamic and more visible contemporary art and cultural content functioning also as a larger operational platform, which will provide the needed structural and human support.

The current governing structure, which consists of equal level of rights and responsibility, stays within the main partners and co-founders of Kino Kultura, Theatre Navigator Cvetko and Lokomotiva. However, models and plans for further inclusion of other partners on equal level are to be developed and implemented.

Possible Models

Within the approach in the development of Kino Kultura there is a specific situation, where organizations- founders have a different legal status, Lokomotiva being a civil organization and Theatre Navigator Cvetko a private theatre company. Their purpose is to produce publically relevant art and cultural content, without profit oriented activities, although from a legal aspect, Cvetko can engage in such activities. However, both organizations are oriented toward development and rethinking of the model that would amplify the public relevance and value.

The model of governing Kino Kultura can be developed in the above mentioned directions and applied through different legal frameworks – *cultural institution; foundation,* and *company*. All of the legal frameworks have their own regulative standpoints and are open to the level of hybridisation as much as the regulation allows. According to those levels, the choice between one legal format from the other becomes clearer (i.e. the option should be the legal format that allows for most operational and governing flexibility, hybridity and adaptability).

Legal levels, as mentioned before, are not satisfactory and the development of new, relevant institutional models and public spaces in Macedonia requires a legislative change.

Recommendations – contributions to finding a way forward

Many attempts were made during the workshop to assess the optimal way forward in developing "Kino Kultura". What came as apparent, that there are obvious obstacles in sense of "personalized cultural policies" and limited resources, both in regulative and financial terms. Also, the formation of a more concrete cooperation between the civil-society organisations, the current and potential users, was considered as premature at present.

For that reason, the following was concluded and it should serve as a direction of planning action:

- The civil society partner organisations should form a *"Kino Kultura" platform*. The task of the platform should be to discuss and negotiate terms of cooperation between all stakeholders in the platform. This is a first step towards enabiling participation and wider inclusion.
- The platform should have a time limit of existence and should serve as a tactical cooperative endeavour of organisations that use or/and will use "Kino Kultura". The proposed period for platform is three years. During the three years, organisations included in the platform should (possibly) take turns in leading the platform so that no single organisation has to take the entire weight of financial, time and people management of the platform.
- Within the three years, platform should: devise a Management Plan for "Kino Kultura". The Management plan must regulate key aspects of operation: what type of cultural space is "Kino Kultura"? What kind of cultural production does it support and promote? What type of organisations and what profile of cultural and artistic activity holds a priority in "Kino Kultura"? Who are the key stakeholders? What are their levels of involvement and responsibility? What is the mode of financial operation and funding scheme?
- In line with the setting the conceptual founding of the "Kino Kultura", the platform should support the programmes planned by the core organisations, namely programmes "Open Space", "Together", etc. The programme planning shall also respect the annual programmes' timetable and requirements by the two core organisations Theatre Navogator Cvetko and Lokomotiva. In this way, the civil and

programme constituency is built without harming the original production and programmes.

- The management of the spatial resource has to take into account the following categories upon which a financial plan must be created: rent and running costs (on annual basis); technical equipment and maintenance (encompassing capital investment for purchase of the equipment); financial planning and accounting; the dynamics in workforce (the number of employees and the contract status / full time or part time); cleaning and maintenance; programme planning; educational programme for the employees and associates (cultural education in fields as arts management, fund raising, curatorial practices, etc.).
- Long-term wise, the financial plan must be made for the restoration/renovation of the entire "Kino Kulture" building, in order to activate it fully with cultural activity. This line of planning must be done in accordance with the owners, local government and the partners from the civil society sector. Ideally, such restoration project should be included in the priority list of capital investments for the Ministry of Culture (the site has a 2nd degree of protection).
- Special consideration has to be given to the commercial aspect of the "Kino Kultura" functioning. This refers to the organizing of the bar, bookshop, socio-creative industries shops and sales of creative merchandise that is a product of socially responsible enterprises. Then public tender for the use of commercial spaces should be done by invitation and announced by the owners and civil society actor, or the "Kino Kultura" platform. Prior to this, the original contract from 2015 should be amended so that additional spaces can be annexed in the lease and permitted to be sub-leased for above listed purposes (bar, bookshop, etc.).

Proposed timeline of action

- **2017**: formation of "Kino Kultura" platform, preparation for Alliance "Kino Kultura", pre-negotiation of the relationship with the owners (inclusion of the owners as stakeholders). The civil formation of the platform is created from the non-governmental organisation in arts and culture; independent artists and cultural wokers; and private initiative in culture. The work of the platform is based on co-sharing of responsibilities and funds for the functioning of the platform. One of the first activities of the platform is to prepare the ground documents that regulate the platform itself, its constituency, main ethos, rationale and objectives of operation. This document should be devised and considered as a strategic plan for "Kino Kultura". Its time span should be divided into two parts – the initial preparatory period (up to the end of 2018, of the founding of the new legal entity) and up to 2025 in order to propose sustainable plans, mechanisms and instruments through which "Kino Kultura" will function and be maintained. The membership in the platform should include the key actors from the CSO sector, encompassing current partner organisations and producers of the programme in "Kino Kultura", but should anticipate the inclusion of local government/municipality and local community. Municipality being one of the key funders of "Kino Kultura" should definitely be included in the governance levels as a stakeholder and partner for the future planning of "Kino Kultura".

- **2018**: formation of Alliance "Kino Kultura" and the establishment of the criteria for usage of the "Kino Kultura" centre/venue. This is the professionalization stage of the "Kino Kultura" development t in that platform becomes "legalized" as an alliance of civil society associations and the criteria is set as a result of guiding principle and

ambitions for achieving sustainable functioning. The criteria are based on the two-tiered approach: the first is qualitative in sense that is promotes the profile of programme (critical and reflexive cultural and artistic practices that foster innovative modes of contemporary creativity; programmes that demonstrate a clear shift away from the dominant cultural practices; innovative collaborative practices in arts and culture, but also across sectors (education, science, tourism, environmental protection). The second is concerned with the financial sustainability of the venue and regulates the ratio between modes of usage. This entails the percentages of space usage for free or without a fee; percentage for a price that has a scale depending on the quality of the programme and the profile of the programme producer (in accordance with the qualitative criteria); and straight commercial rent of the space in full price but with disclaimer that any programme has to comply with the overall concept of the "Kino Kulture" (namely, the commercial use cannot entail dominant forms of culture, like commercial pop-folk music, political and religious gatherings, and any other forms of content that do not promote tolerance and inclusiveness). During this phase, it would be advisable to include Ministry of Culture in the deliberation on the future legal formation of "Kino Kultura", which will be an innovation in national cultural sector and institutional setting. For this reason, the Ministry of Culture should "stay close" during the consultation period in order to provide support from the national level and to prepare for the possible change in the cultural policy structures that would then accommodate further examples of mixed and hybrid institutions based on cooperative and participative governance. The Alliance should form an Advisory Board that would inform, supervise, follow and work on the process of forming a legal entity.

2019: formation of legal entity "Kino Kultura". "Kino Kultura" can take several options. One of the most feasible one was the combination of civil-private partnerships with the public stakeholders in form of foundation. This entails the founding of the private entity in which civil society actors holds the equal position among the stakeholders. The ratio of this model is that the private owners invest their infrastructure in the foundation (or *the hardware*), while the civil partners invest the programme (*or the software*). Combined, this type of cooperation forms a unique instance not only in South East Europe, but also in wider international cultural scene. In this combination, the public authorities are limited to being partners as funders, but not as co-founding body of the new established foundation. There are two readings to this situation. The first is that the limited involvement of the public authorities means limited political influence over the matter and greater autonomy in developing "Kino Kultura". The second one is that without the public authority, the objective of long-term sustainability can be hindered. Moreover, the inclusion of public authorities ensures the "public" visibility and, in a sense, the value of the whole endeavour.

This has to be considered carefully throughout the 2017 and 2018.[93]

[93] Acknowledgements for the research and development of Kino Kultura
Theatre Navigator Cvetko: Pavle Ignovski, Director and professor Slobodan Unkovski-founder and programme editor, theatre director, Doyen of the Macedonian Theatre; — Aco Dukovski and Viktorija Kostova Volchkova for the interviews that supported the research process; — Elena Risteska for transcribing the interviews and for being an active member of Lokomotiva and the Kino Kultura team; — Members of the Open Scene Advisory Body, who gave their contribution in the development of the "PROTOCOL for collaboration with the civil society in the frame of the Kino Kultura's programme line Open Scene": Ivo Baru (Kontrakadar), Erina Filipovska and Milan Dinevski (Citi Creative Network), Ivana Dragšić (Ploshtad Sloboda), Sofia Goseva Cholanchevska (Blue Bird, association for supporting children and youth with diversities), Filip Jovanovski and Ivana Vaseva (Faculty of Things That Cannot Be Learned), Violeta Kachakova and Biljana Tanurovska Kjulavkovski (Lokomotiva), Oliver Musovikj (independent artist), Bojana Nizamovska (Youth Open Forum), Ivan Toromanoski (Idea Plus) and Milan Zivkovic (Friedrich Ebert Foundation); — Ana Žuvela, researcher at Zagreb "Institute for Development and International Relations", moderator of the workshop for Kino Kultura model development, held in Belgrade (28, 29 April 2017), organised by the Foundation Jelena Šantić, project partner in Dissonant (Co)Spaces project; — Participants in the Belgrade workshop for Kino Kultura model development: Robert Alagjozovski, current Minister of Culture of the Republic of Macedonia, Ruse Arsov – programme editor and executive producers in the Youth Cultural Centre, Filip Jovanovski – president of the Faculty of Things That Cannot Be Learned, Ivan Toromanoski, project manager at Idea Plus and external collaborator in the project Cultural Spaces for Active Citizens (research on the PPP law).

REZIME DISERTACIJE NA SRPSKOM JEZIKU

Кроз преглед теорија институција, анализе јавних политика и социо-политичког контекста, у овој тези предложени су теоријски и методолошки оквири за концептуализацију институција за извођачке уметности, односно за савремене перформативне праксе (плес, перформанс и кореографија), који ће се у овој тези доследно именовати извођачким уметностима, јер су најчешће тако означени у праксама културних политика. За потребе анализе и прегледа система културних институција, предложен је теоријски оквир постмодерне перспективе који долази из организацијске теорије која се фокусира на деконструкцију организацијских текстова, дестабилизујући менаџерске идеологије и модернистичке моделе организовања и теоретизирања, откривајући маргинализоване и потиснуте, репресиране ставове, подржавајући рефлексивне и инклузивне форме теоретизирања и организовања.

Овакав став нуди теоријску основу за преиспитивање организационог формата културне институције кроз деконструкцију менаџментског модела, што је свакако условљено њеним садржајем, као и политичким и идеолошким премисама на којима је успостављена. Ова теоријска перспектива посматра плес, кореографију и перформанс као проширене перформативне праксе или као перформанс/извођачке уметности, нудећи деконструкцију доминантних менаџерских модела институција у области кореографије, плеса и перформанса, балета и позоришта и нудећи нову менаџерску перспективу.

Такође, овај приступ нуди могућност да се ове уметничке праксе размотре кроз нови угао који, у овом случају, није условљен дисциплином или традицијом као полазним пољима вредности. Овде се предлаже и користи као методолошки приступ

деконструкција модернистичке менаџерске парадигме културних установа покушавајући да појача глас једног маргинализованог поља, пружајући нове рефлексивне форме теоретизирања и организовања.

Ова перспектива нуди постмодерну менаџерску парадигму у култури и односи се на оно што је у тези означено појмовима: постмодерна институција, сарадња, хетерогени менаџмент, самоорганизовани системи. Начин формирања такве институције је кроз партиципативно управљање и ризоматско управљање (организационо) са заједничким руководством. То је повезано са приступом у креирању политике на *дељење политике* (Драгићевић, Дрезгић 2017).

Теза предлаже институцију као произвођача друштвености или социјално и политички релевантног садржаја насупрот установе као произвођача естетике. Таква институција се налази на пољу *ограничене производње* (Бурдије) где су могући прогресивни приступи, или на пољу које тежи аутономији где су принципи одређени од њих самих, или по речима Сајмона Шеика, само-увођењем. Оне раде са стратегијама које би побољшале стварање *културе квалитета.*

Докторска теза обухвата 323 странице, које имају следеће делове: садржај, прво поглавље: увод (шест потпоглавља), друго поглавље (шест потпоглавља), треће поглавље (четири потпоглавља), четврто поглавље (три потпоглавља), пето поглавље (четири потпоглавља), шесто поглавље (четири потпоглавља), седмо поглавље: као закључак који садржи једно потпоглавље, и на крају као додатак, студија случаја. Садржај осмог поглавља: библиографија и биографија. Текст има и 93 фуснота и 107 референца.

У уводу су разрађени кључни аспекти помоћу којих се савремене извођачке уметничке институције могу да (пре)формирају, предлажући перспективу увођења нове

институционалне вредности кроз микрополитичке уметничке праксе и друштвено релевантан садржај као принципа „поновног проналаска“ јавних институција. Ово казује да је институционални модел могућ као контекстни модел, а институција може бити друштвени агент који омогућава хетерогеност уметности или њихов 'институционални превод' у дати контекст. Фокус је на развоју институционалног модела (теоретски подржан и омогућен кроз механизме практичних политика) који треба да обухвати извођачку праксу која се бави кореографијом као проширеном праксом, третирајући перформанс из перспективе различитих медија, проширујући дисциплинарне границе извођења итд.

Предмет истраживања у овој тези односи се на појам институције у култури, идентификацију методолошких, теоријских и политичких (policy) потенцијала који ће омогућити његово даље истраживање, проучавање и примену у одређеном социо-културном, економском и политичком контексту. Реч је о анализи различитих теоријских дискурса, који укључују социологију, теорију организације, критичку теорију, студије учинка и теорију управљања. Штавише, она укључује и анализу пракси и принципа рада у цивилном сектору, односно независном сектору у Македонији и бившој Југославији, у којем се остварује највећи део савремених уметничких пракси. Такав индуктивни приступ омогућава редефинисање савремене институције перформативних уметности као уметничког система. **Предмет истраживања** обухвата следеће компоненте: 1. управљање културним институцијама (теорија организације, социологија, теорија управљања, критичка теорија); 2. интердисциплинарни приступ у уметности; микроорганизационе моделе, њихове праксе (програмирање, сарадња, куратирање), стратегије и тактике; 3. културну политику и друштвено-политички развој (контекстуализација перформативних уметности).

Истраживачко питање је: Који су теоријски и културно-политички приступи који могу одговарати потребама у пољу савремене извођачке уметности, и њиховим потенцијалима и створити нову управљачку парадигму и нови модел организације или институције савремене извођачке уметности која може побољшати квалитативни развој поља ? Друга потпитања су:

- Како се теорије могу имплементирати у постојећем социо-културном и економском контексту и културном систему, или који је методолошки оквир њихове примене на терену?
- Како културни систем треба да одговара потребама културних радника?
- Које су методологије подршке креирања културне политике одоздо, које подржавају институционалне реформе или формирање нових модела установе и радних услова?
- Колико је могуће побољшати организационо управљање новим управљачким приступима?

Општи циљ тезе је да се идентификују и успостављају нове институционалне теорије, унутар којих ће се изучавати савремена пракса извођачких уметности. Посебни циљеви су:

Истражити појам институције и његове примене кроз аналитичко, дескриптивно, пројектно и програмско моделирање, као и научно-теоријске и аналитичке алате; Истражити различите методе критике и деконструкције већ постојећих теорија Истраживање методологија стварања нових модела институција за савремене сценске уметности.

Полазна тачка ове докторске тезе јесте **општа хипотеза** која тврди да квалитативни модел институције за савремене (извођачке) уметности није могућ без теоријске и политичке анализе и истраживања контекстуалних социо-политичких и културних

специфичности, као и потреба уметничке области, заснованих на критичком размишљању и партиципативном дијалогу. Да би се тестирала ова општа хипотеза, предложено је неколико специфичних хипотеза.

Методологија истраживања је интердисциплинарна и обухвата 1) теоретско истраживање; 2) теренска истраживања а) интервјуе б) учешће у различитим иницијативама заговарања и утицања на јавне политике (конференција, догађаја, састанака, уметничких пројеката); в) студије случаја иницијатива заговарања у области извођачких уметности, као и студије случаја јавно-грађанских или јавно-приватних модела институција у Македонији, бившој Југославији и Европи; и, г) метод систематског посматрања. 3. Методе анализе теорија и политика и тумачења. 4. Упоредна анализа теорија и примењене јавне политике. (стр. 16-18).

У другом **поглављу Институционални хоризонт - замишљање институције,** ауторка третира разлику између традиционалних и савремених институција културе и разумевања појма институције која се у институционалној теорији разликују као два случаја који се односе на концепт "зависности од путева" (стр. 24) - у смислу стварања културне политике као "институционалног система", тј. као организованог обрасца за успостављање и спровођење јавне политике на пољу културе, и као система традиционалних организација као што су позоришта, библиотеке, музеји и друго, који раде и функционишу као "институције" (Kangas и Vestheim, 2010). Овде је, поред приказа расправа и предлога за промене праваца институционалне (ре)форме, дата анализа најдоминантнијег policy тренда "Ново јавно управљање" развијеног током осамдесетих година са циљем увођења "пословног" модела за јавне институције, као и преобликовање јавних институција према моделима из приватног сектора.

"Принцип изврсности" у одређеној активности и заштита вредности у одређеном пољу на основу развоја парадигме подржане истраживањем, теоријским радом и естетском рефлексијом, функција је традиционалних институција у култури. Оне истовремено успостављају парадигму или систем класификације који се односи на поље у развоју, развијајући односе између пракси на терену (традиционално, ново или драмско позориште, експериментално, пост-драмско, физичко, плесно позориште и друго) који се хијерархијски формирају. Овим је објашњено да је плес подсистем у различитим хијерархијским системима јавних културних политика који те односе дефинишу. Тако теза показује да су традиционалне институције као места производње естетике одређене системом класификације одређеног домена, попут позоришта, а не различитим друштвеним праксама. Из перспективе плеса, или савременог плеса и пракси извођачких уметности, поље се суочава са проблемом класификације, а тиме и препознавања и саморазумевања. Конвенција о плесу је успостављена институционално и, у одређеној културној парадигми, припада класичном балету или традиционалној институцији културе. Други изрази плеса, као што су модерни, савремени и / или експериментални, нису препознати јер углавном комуницирају са својим професионалним окружењем, а не са доминантном институцијом. У потпоглављу *2.2 Формирање институција - прошлост, садашњост, језик, замишљање, самоинституционализација*, утврђени су теоријски ставови о институцијама и њиховој улози у јавној сфери исказаној идеологијом управљања. Институције су организације које оснивају људи чији би циљ требало бити да проактивно ре-дефинишу и поново потврђују систем вредности које представљају. Другим речима, институција репрезентује систем вредности, манифестација је одређене идеологије (Алтисер, 1970), део је идеолошког апарата државе, а већина њих је део јавне сфере, али и приватне. Разлика између приватне и јавне је у праву да могу да врше своју "моћ" у одређеним

доменима. Алтисер наводи да важност није у приватноме или јавноме, већ у начину на који функционишу. Истовремено, институције не видимо само као јавне институције према систему управљања, већ као институције које производе јавност и јавно релевантни садржај, као друштвено релевантне инстанце. Стога су дате различите теоријске перспективе кроз које је јавна сфера сагледавана: кроз преглед јавне сфере у 18 веку Европе од стране немачког социолога и филозофа, Јиргена Хабермаса; из перспективе студија културне политике МекГигена (1996) (McGuigan, 1996), 23); спровођење институционалне критике (Маја Ћирић 2012); анализу јавне сфере као социјалног и политичког концепта, али и као „перформанс“ (Вујановић и Цвејић, 2012).

У потпоглављу *2.2.2 Управљање хоризонтом институција кроз прошлост и садашњост,* представљени су различити правци разумевања процеса "увођења" (Шеик, 2011; Касторијадис) који кажу да је друштво имагинарна институција, што указује на то да оно што држи друштво заједно - "институција друштва у целини". Овде су уведени услови оснивања и самоустановљења, разликујући реформе према променама метода успостављања, предлажући како се субјективност и машта могу покренути на други начин, "надземно" и "подземно" те да стварање институција треба описати у смислу њиховог изгледа, њиховог обима - њиховог хоризонта (Sheikh, 2011, стр. 19), стварајући *хетерогено управљање и моделирање* на основу теоретских димензија које подржавају могућност *подземног* или *самоустановљеног* система културних институција, или још више, *кооперативно-хоризонтални модели* који се не би придржавали тржишта и владине логике, већ би предлагали нову управну логику (постинституционалну) која би подржала експерименталну сцену и артикулацију контра-култура. Овде је уведен постинституционални модел као "ко-институција" где "ко" означава сарадњу, заједничко, коегзистирајуће. Други приказ: пост-институција, дат је преко бијеналног примера Гиелена (2009), као институције периодичног

карактера засноване на догађајима (што омогућава рад са привременим уговорима, "које је у данашњем уметничком свету прилично романтично преведена у некритичко култивисање номадског постојања у оквиру константно покретних мрежа". У тези, пост-институција се не види као пост-фордистичка организација, нити као Гиленов модел Бијенала, већ напротив, као модел који би балансирао пост-фордовски институционални почетак и класичну модерну институцију. Поглавље *2.3 Језик (пост)институције* предлаже модел *пост-институције као ко-институцију*, или као један од могућих модела хетерогеног управљања и моделирања. Он захтева размишљање о *језику* и начину комуникације те форматима које производимо унутар система као самоустановљени субјекти. Термин „формат“ у тези се користи као израз који описује начин рада или "начин пружања одређене тактике кроз облике" (Шуваковић, 2010). Нови формати по садржају и језику, ипак морају бити упућени *политици бирократије,* или *политици администрације* (Sheikh, 2011), захтевајући језик који ће омогућити комуникацију кроз нормативне акте где се могу извршити промене. Мора се иницирати израда новог језичког система која би значила и израду система референци, одређене терминологије, контекстуализацију одређених термина, итд. Дати су примери постмодерне теорије организације, повезани са теоријом де Сосира (језик има импликације на разумевање проучавања и управљања организацијама), као и теоријама које се баве коришћењем речи и знакова, као *заједницама значења* (појам Витгенштајна о језичким играма). У вези са теоријом организације, Мери Џо Хеч (2006) објашњава да језичке игре промовишу различите идеје о томе шта је тачно или на који начин организације могу бити описане и објашњене. Штавише, разумевање и језик (у ширем значењу) су повезани са *културним добрима* која се виде као *симболички ентитети* који преносе и представљају различита значења и вредности у различитим контекстима.

У поглављу *2.4 Замишљајући будућност (пост)институције кроз прошлост, садашњост и будућност,* предлаже се замишљање као додатни приступ визионирању, као тактика: магловита имагинација чини да институције рационализују свој напредак и раст (Kunst, 2017); имагинација је производња новог хоризонта, нови поглед (Sheikh, 2011). Имагинација је везана за будућност, међутим, као методологија, мора да балансира историју, прошлост и будућност. Веза између фикције и реалности је могућа ако се бавимо историчношћу кроз садашњост или укључимо прошлост кроз садашњу перспективу. Замишљање и самоустановљавање предлажу се као тактика, део система у коме се нови *алати, норме, вредности, процедуре и методе баве стварима и раде ствари*. Такве тактике, које производе нови хоризонт, спроводе се у малим или (још увек) невидљивим пројектима, фестивалима, радионицама, платформама, колективима, мрежама које се тиме и радом мењају и померају парадигму из *хетерономнога (*хетерономна друштва), и приписују своје имагинарије некој власти ван друштва (нпр. Богу, држави, прецима, историјској нужди итд.) ка *самоустановљеној независној позицији.*

У делу 2.5 Моделовање институције кроз визионирање, кроз перспективу социолошких студија представља се неколико разлика о томе како научници гледају институције: институција се гледа у *два правца* - као конкретне организације људи, ствари, инфраструктуре итд. (позоришта, галерије, музеји, уметнички центри); а *с друге стране* то су системи вредности, протокола и норми који се сматрају релевантним у друштву (јединствени режим вредности који представљају идеолошке државне норме у одређеном контексту, чак и ако то установа не жели да подржава, она је њима „обликована“). Дата је и разлика у контексту *друштвених форми* које нису институције, као што су ритуали, друштвене норме, друштвене улоге, дешавања и друго. Неки научници размишљају о институцијама као *конкретним облицима,* или

ближим *организацијама* (Osterberg, 1977, цитирано у: Kangas и Vestheim, 2010) које су *супротне општим аранжманима* као што су породица, брак, религија и друго а које се називају *"друштвене формације"* (Osterberg и Engelstad, 1995, цитирано у: Kangas и Vestheim, 2010). На пољу културних студија, институције се виде као *блокови* кроз које се развија друштвени и политички живот, а институционални оквир дефинише циљеве и обликује средства путем којих се утврђују културни интереси и / или јавни интереси у култури (Жувела, 2015, стр. 33). Уставне или конвенционалне обавезе које институција има, повећавају несигурност људи у институцији и ограничавају њихову аутономију. Кунст (2017) сугерише да је институционализација никад завршен, комплетиран, процес, али мора да функционише између "извођења институције и одбијања самог процеса институционализације", јер она никад не може бити конституисана као таква (Athanasiou, 2015, цитирано у: Kunst, 2017). Међутим, примарни недостатак је положај уметника или културног радника у независном сектору (посебно у балканским земљама), а не у институцијама. Огромна разлика у економији игра кључну улогу када се разговара о институцијама, јер утиче на услове рада, програмирање и друге аспекте који чине уметничку институцију. Штавише, моделирање институције је увек везано за питања политике, ангажовања одређених *друштвених органа*. Институције су *организациони ентитети, облици размене и имплицитне конвенције,* (Werner Hasitschka, Peter Tschmuck и Tasos Zembylas, 2005). Због тога, *"сложена ритмичка петља између деловања као да и замишљања оног што још није"* мора се оспорити и треба комуницирати другачије *политичке, економске и друштвене утицаје.* Неколико друштвених органа и институција утичу на формирање сфере културних институција (види Zembylas, 1997, у: Hasitschka, Tschmuck и Zembylas, 2005, стр. 48), и могу се сматрати *'машинама за вертикализацију'* (Gielen, 2009), али и делом заједнице или "*ко-институције",* које проистичу из заједнице, латински "con" или "com" (Gielen, 2013). Са

становишта *студија културних институција* развијају се функционалистички концепти у друштвеним и политичким наукама који кажу да "институције не регулишу само друштвене акције, него да се такође формирају друштвеним акцијама" (Hasitschka, Tschmuck и Zembylas, 2005). Витгенштајн тврди, "институције структурирају друштвену акцију, али оне њу не одређују". Дефинисањем институција само кроз међусобне односе и међусобне зависности друштвених власти, студије културних институција искључују моћ културних заједница или заједница уметничких и културних пракси.

У делу *2.6 Пост-институционална и пост-менаџерска парадигма* вратили смо се на разумевање пост-институције као пост-фордовске институције (Gielen, 2009), као корак напред из *патерналистичке институције* према *модерној организацији* (В. Чопић, 2011), ка предлагању пост-институције као дела пост-менаџерске парадигме - што би повећало управно дискреционо право без губитка културне мисије. Или, другим речима, како бити на руководећем положају који би се залагао за суштину и ослобађање нових уметничких израза? (В. Чопић, 2011) не поштујући само логику раста, тржишта или државних руководилаца који долазе из "партије на власти"? Овде се пост-институција предлаже као хетерогени модел хибридне институције, уз заједничко управљање, заједнички модел управљања, модел проширене сарадње, заједничко руководство, нову јавну културу (јавни простори - модели јавне сфере) итд. Ти други "принципи" и приступи пост-институције могу да доводе у питање не само економске управљачке моделе, већ и традиционалне моделе институција и доприносе стварању нових примера пост-институција у пост-менаџерској парадигми. Овде се предлаже и поновно размишљање о принципима као не-рестриктивним, као оним који могу створити ново значење и нову постинституционалну парадигму. Ако политичка идеологија, или још више, систем у којем је политичка моћ организована у једном

друштву - није систем демократије, тада је модернизација јавне уметничке институције уистину немогућа. Демократски контекст и реформе су међузависне, као и демократско друштво и савремена уметност. Бахтин говори о *хронотопу - међузависности времена и простора или* конституисању мреже посматрања помоћу којих се културни производи контекстуализују као и њихова перцепција.

Овим се такође објашњава да је управљање синоним за јавни менаџмент, а управљање је такође и организацијско управљање. Стога овде схватамо три начина управе/управљања: 1. јавни менаџмент (већа за културу или други органи за доношење „policy-related" одлука), 2. управне структуре (тела у јавним институцијама) и 3. организациона управа (тимови и пројектно управљање).

У делу *2.7 Методологија и тактика ка моделирању нових институција, интернализацији критике и пракси или паралелној агенцији промена,* прегледане су различите тактике и методологије у реформи или увођењу нових институционалних модела: стратегија "ангажовања са институцијама" (Mouffe, 2013); вертикализацију процеса доношења одлука као могућег новог начина увођења добрих пракси или промене структура институција (Lorey, 2013); дијалектичка критика као прикладнији модел институционалне критике у погледу позитивне агенције деловања, уместо интерне институционалне критике или најпродуктивније институционалне критике која може на крају довести до самопарезије (Милевска, 2007); "трансгресивне институције које проблематизују и прекидају са актуелним развојем приватизације и истовремено се усмеравају према другим дисциплинама и областима поред корпоративног пословања глобализованог капитализма, као и *агенси деловања* уместо интерне критике, као организоване мреже, или *привремена платформа* - сматрају се заједничким пројектима или заједничким акцијама, што би омогућило интернализацију неких акција. (Möntmann, 2007); институција која није институција (Antoniolli у: Möntmann, 2008),

неконституисана институција, *"сложена ритмичка петља између деловања као да и замишљања оног што још није"* (Kunst, 2017). Наиме, институција која би демонтирала своје политичке и стратешке функције и била активна изван владиног утицаја, радећи на дестабилизацији и стабилизацији институције као трајног начина.

У трећем поглављу ***Организовање институционалне имагинације или организовање (пост)институционалне парадигме,*** у првом делу, 3.1 Организација и институција, дају се компаративне анализе и објашњава да се институција може разликовати од организације тако што се дефинишу *институције као структуре које дефинишу социјалне власти*, и организације *као групе људи формиране* како би се постигли одређени заједнички циљеви појединаца. Постоје и сличности и разлике које би могле бити идентификоване између организације и институције. Институције представљају одређену идеологију или демократске вредности или третирају *одређене функције и потребе*, док је организација *друштвена групација* коју је основала група људи који деле исте вредности и потребе. Дакле, може се рећи да *обим функције институције* носи већи *друштвени циљ*, док је *опсег функција организација мањи*. Друга разлика везана је за начин оснивања, као и за питање отворености и инклузивности. Разлика је и њихова јавна улога, да ли је реч о аутономним, "јавним просторима", *где се стварају друштвене везе*, и који имају улогу у стварању јавне сфере. Односи између организација и институција гледају се кроз *економске теорије* и *теорије организације*. Теорија организације Мери Џо Хеч разликује социолошку теорију и теорију управљања (стр. 72) истичући два правца којим објашњава захтеве окружења над организацијама: *један* је технички, економски а *други* су социјални, културни, правни и политички захтеви да играју одређену улогу у друштву. Ауторка тезе доноси и мишљење о томе да *културни утицаји* (норме, вредности и очекивања), *друштвени утицаји* (жеља бити или изгледати као друга институција) и *политички утицаји* (закони) обликују

институционално подручје, *или институције се контекстуално формирају и формирају кроз понављање поступака, као што је миметички* (Powell и DiMaggio у: Hatch и Cunliffe, 2006). Организације такође могу бити дефинисане *као "материјализовани изрази" општег концепта институције* (Kangas и Vestheim, 2010). "Типична карактеристика институција је да су релативно трајне, што значи да постану институције, оне морају да функционишу током времена (Weber 1947; Parsons & Smelser, 1956)" (Kangas и Vestheim, 2010). Другим речима, време и трајност су компоненте које се односе на то *да ли је одређени облик организоване активности институција или не. Карактеристике које разликују су стабилност или трајност*, да се *историјски институционализам* одлучује у *институционалној теорији*. Питање *сигурности* је пожељно (Raunig и Ray, 2009), али проблем је како се одржати. Друга разлика се може наћи у *системима одлучивања* кроз које се дистрибуира моћ. Структура улога традиционалних институција *или вертикална хијерархија* је организациони начин, док је она у независним организацијама другачија, представљена у *различитим системима: самоорганизована, хоризонтална или спирална хијерархија итд.* У институционалној теорији, постоје најмање три различите перспективе које су предложили Кангас и Вестхајм (2010), кроз које се институције за културу могу анализирати. То укључује *рационални избор, социолошки и историјски институционализам.*

У делу *3.2 Стратешко планирање и доношење одлука у организацијама и институцијама,* акценат се ставља на неопходност организационог развоја или промене институција, стратешког управљања, процеса заједничког за институције и организације (Варбанова 2013), који се поставља као аналитички и практичан процес, јер се стратешко управљање користи наизменично са терминима корпоративне стратегије, пословне политике и стратешког планирања. Аутор тезе даје перспективу

како *стратешко планирање* у уметности и културним организацијама долази у регион бивше Југославије кроз независне организације у култури (цивилно друштво) јер су оне прве, на захтев донатора, почеле анализирати, планирати, пратити и оцењивати. Ауторка тезе то повезује са специфичним стратешким планирањем у одређеном контексту (Драгићевић Шешић и Драгојевић, 2005) и анализира менаџерску парадигму и улогу институција. Предлаже тактике поменуте раније, као што су "*тактика имагинације"*, предложена као менаџерско-*хеуристички алат*, део *само-организационог* процеса који омогућава аранжмане кроз експеримент, где се положаји мењају или где се - *радећи* - *установљење може десити*. Менаџерска теорија која подржава такве хеуристичке алате и процесе јесте *теорија система* која полази од спољашњег окружења које утиче на модел менаџмента. У оквиру *теорија система*, капацитет система за стварање своје сложеније структуре назива се *самоорганизација* (Meadows, 2008).

У делу *3.2.1 Самоорганизација као управљање и доношење одлука,* предложене су теорије које подржавају реформе, односно самоорганизацију која претпоставља хетерогеност (стр. 81/82). Напомиње се да се у теорији система, разумевање света у организованим подсистемима агрегираним у већим подсистемима, уређење тих система назива хијерархија. Принцип хијерархије у културном систему или подсистемима, *може бити хетерономичан или аутономан* (Бурдије). Саморганизована структура налази се само у аутономној. Истакнуто је да хијерархијски системи треба да се развијају одоздо према горе и требају служити нижим нивоима, који се често злоупотребљавају и стога не функционишу сврховито. Теорија система бави се значењем система (Meadows, 2008). Са аспекта теорије, појам самоорганизације у култури и уметности може се артикулисати као подсистем који се креира "одоздо", углавном у тренутку када су културне политике и институционалне политике створене

"одозго". Хијерархија у самоорганизованим подсистемима може се развити под аутономним принципом хијерархизације (Бурдије), који не препознаје законе тржишта као меру успеха, већ признавање од других актера у одређеном културном пољу. Самоорганизоване системе карактеришу флексибилност, отвореност према новим идејама, токовима комуникације, солидарност и генеративност. Самоорганизовани системи представљају генерички скуп алата, процедура, тактика и протокола, као и простора или поља произведених знања и вредности. Овакви системи одговарају уметности и култури као пољима трансформационог потенцијала, заснованим на иновацијама, експериментисању, истраживању и тражењу промена (тако њихов трансформацијски потенцијал интервенише у друштвеним односима). Могуће је да се модел организације/институције уведе у хијерархију (према теорији система), тако да *вишеструки самоорганизовани, ризоматски подсистеми* комуницирају своју динамику и генеришу потребне идеје. Самоорганизовани систем не одређује, али се бави одређеним потенцијалом у којем су могуће трансформације (анализирано у оквиру поља кореографије, како услови рада, сет алата, компетенција и знања могу произвести динамику која се генерише у нова знања и одређене исходе, изнутра, из потреба). Поред тога што су дати пример локалних иницијатива, дисертација сведочи и о појави регионалних[94] иницијатива као што су мреже и платформе које су се формирале на основу самоуправљања у бившој Југославији, истичући контекст у којем су се појавиле

[94] Дефинисање региона у контексту у којем пишем ову тезу је од суштинског значаја, посебно у односу на политичке изразе који се користе за дефинисање региона бивше Југославије у протеклих 10 година, почевши од југоисточне Европе до западног Балкана и др. Пошто су ти административни и политички називи били / нису погодни за праксе и иницијативе које се појављују у региону бивше Југославије, који сада укључује и неке суседне земље, многи од њих су дефинирали описно регион или користећи речи попут Балкан, бивша Југославије плус Албанија, или Бугарска, и тако даље. Или, једноставно дефинисање региона кроз постојећу културну сарадњу и друштвени капитал. Међутим, овде, у оквиру региона, третирам сарадњу у бившој Југославији, а ако у неким примерима учествује и друга земља, ја ћу то прецизирати.

и зашто су постале метода за стварање аутономних простора у којима се омогућава критична пракса и видљивост, као и метода која би омогућила постојање уметника у таквом простору.

Следеће поглавље 3.3 Модели и начини установа и организација у извођачкој уметности, даје преглед институција организованих у области извођачких уметности, од традиционалних установа и других модела до самоорганизованих, постинституционалних, аутономних или хетерогених простора. Почиње са представљањем парадигме "Артворлд" (Данто и Дики): уметничка сфера којој припадају институције уметничког домена. Уметност се може схватити као сама институција, увођењем и развојем овог израза кроз који су приказане парадигме у којима постоји и развија се различита уметност. У делу *3.3.1 Општи модели - стандардни модел и модел сарадње,* проучава се мапа развоја различитих позоришних институција у контекстима Западне културе и југоисточног Балкана, на основу које се примећује како је диверзификација производних процеса у позоришту током година донела нове трендове и могућности трансформације. (Драган Клаић, 2012) Ауторка тезе позива се на ове моделе тврдећи да су то биле парадигме на којима су у Западној Европи основане различите нове плесне институције или продукцијске куће које подржавају плес. У делу 3.3.2. *Стандардни модел (традиционална/мејнстрим, хомогенизована менаџерска структура)*, уведен је традиционални или мејнстрим модел културне институције (хомогенизована менаџерска структура, стандардна систематизација радних места), након чега следи део о специфичностима *стандардно - вертикалног модела* које обухвата јавно, комерцијално и независно позоришт. То се разликује од *стандарда* који посматра модел јавне (позоришне) институције западне Европе укорењене у идеологији национализма из 19. века. Иако постоје алтернативни модели јавних позоришних простора, што су више оријентисани ка сарадничким -

хоризонталним - моделима, такви примери нису бројни. Приказујући и друге историјске карактеристике "стандардног модела" (Клаић 2012), која укључује и примере Комеди-Франсез основане декретом Луја XIV 1680. године, као спајање трупе позоришта Генего и Хотела де Бургоњ и Бургтеатра у Бечу (1741), Московско уметничко академско позориште (МХАТ) 1898. године и алтернативна позоришта у Европи, ауторка тезе отвара питање нормативних модела (политичких и економских) кроз јавне политике и финансијске прописе. Такође се истиче да су након Другог светског рата државе благостања позориште сматрале легитимним корисником и инструментом демократије, што је супротно земљама централне и источне Европе где су се позоришта сматрала моћним медијима идеолошке индоктринације народа (Клаић, 2012). Анализирајући јавне политике види се како геополитички таласи утичу на разумевање организационих и институционалних промена у области позоришта. Многа позоришта су преузела идеје креативних индустрија, и подлегла утицајима јавних политика. Добили су ограничену ефикасност и суштински поражавајуће исходе као што су *Не ради ништа*, *Сакриј се иза уметничког процеса*, *Имитирај комерцијално позориште и Повежи јавно позориште са политичким или друштвеним покретом или групом* (Клаић, 2012). Дате су анализе о инерцији западних, као и јавних националних или градских позоришта у југоисточној Европи. Дискутоване су методе реформе, међутим ауторка подржава Клаића (2012), који предлаже 'екстернализацију установа', отвара теме попут самопарезије, феминизма, ЛГБТИ, заштите животне средине, људских права, солидарности са незапосленима, избеглицама, женама жртвама насиља, итд. – све ове теме могу да мобилишу ресурсе цивилног друштва, који могу имати користи од „савеза“ са позориштем, а позоришта би могла имати користи од веза са њима. Укратко, установе извођачких уметности могу постати „друштвени продуценти“, тј. агенси друштвено-политичких реформи.

Посебна пажња поклоњена је и репертоарском позоришту (*Специфични модел јавног позоришта: Репертоарско позориште)* као модел западног позоришта, опере или балета у којем резидентни ансамбл наизменично представља дела из одређеног репертоара. У делу 3.3.3 *Колаборативни модел* (нови модели, хетерогена управљачка структура, самоувођење), предлаже се нови модел на основу *хетерогене управљачке структуре - самоувођени* систем - или *колаборативни-хоризонтални модел*) као "ко-институција". "Ко", односи се на колаборативно, заједничко, коегзистирајуће, а заснива се на партиципативном управљању или социократији (стр. 106). У следећем делу *3.3.3.1 Модели на алтернативној позоришној сцени "Колаборативни - хоризонтални модел",* представљене су алтернативе репертоарском и комерцијалном позоришту, нове форме које организују студенти, полу или непрофесионалци, професионалци, а касније и непрофитне организације, колективи или удружења. Даје се историјски преглед развоја експерименталног и / или алтернативног позоришта, извршених реформи. Део *3.4 Алтернативно позориште у Македонији,* даје историјски и дијахронијски став о алтернативном позоришту у Македонији, као и о успостављању иницијатива као што је Отворено позориште младих (МОТ), које је у Македонији дало нови позоришни контекст, тврдећи да је алтернатива повезана са филозофским и етичким знањем, као и са новом естетском димензијом.

У поглављу 4**. (Једна) Перспектива о извођачкој уметности, к**оришћењем различитих теоријских ставова пронађених у чланцима, интервјуима, пројектима, дискусијама, радионицама, ауторка се фокусирала на дебатовање ставова развијених у пољу савременог плеса. Ови налази укључују анализу формата или процедура као дела производних процеса, дисеминацију радова и њихову презентацију. Ове специфичности захтевају нове системе управљања, интерне преговоре, комуникације са другим друштвеним властима, као и интерпелације у владајућим политикама. Овде

ауторка даје перспективу на којој ће касније представити модел и методолошки приступ савременог сценског уметничког простора као друштвеног агента или произвођача друштвених односа у контексту Македоније, заснованог на коришћењу постмодерног приступа теорији организације. Таква институција повезује уметничка поља о којима се овде расправља, са отвореним формама производње, стварања и рефлексије, омогућавајући учешће у продукцији „друштвености“. У поглављу *4.1 Плес, кореографија, перформанс као појмови везани за контекст,* предлажу и прегледају се перформативне, сценске извођачке праксе, као што су плес, перформанс и кореографија, кроз теоријску перспективу студије учинка које се баве чином извођења, али и његовим друштвеним, политичким, културним последицама. Такође, у контексту анализе институција савремених сценских уметности предложен је теоријски оквир *постмодерне перспективе теорије организације* која наглашава константно променљиву релацију међу концептима (стр. 115). Када је у овој тези реч о институцији извођачких уметности, размишља се о савременим кореографским и плесним праксама, или о извођачким праксама, плесу, перформансу, кореографији имајући у виду да њихова главна важност мисли на тело кроз два вектора: као уметнички материјал или алат (тј. тело као објекат или уметничко средство) и, што је још важније, тело самог уметника или тело уметника (тј. тело као уметничко дело)' (Вујановић, 2009). Овде се више мисли о другом вектору, или о телу уметника, или о телу као о предмету уметности. Следећи део *4.2. Спектар плеса - основне разлике и специфичности,* даје историјски и естетски, као и политички преглед плесних уметничких форми. Овде ауторка покушава да артикулише употребу појма савремени плес и његове контекстуалне односе. Ситуиран у идеолошки систем, савремени плес тражи своју тактику да демонтира диктате или изводи своје експерименте кроз разне организационе формате стварајући окружење у коме се могу и теоријски артикулисати.

Такво окружење у бившој Југославији је независна културна сцена, у којој се производи нови плесни свет, који се мења, а с њим и значења многих појмова попут плеса и кореографије. Дати су примери коришћења израза кореографија од стране различитих научника и кореографа. У делу 4.3. *Плес, кореографија и перформанс као појмови и поља у Македонији,* приказани су историјски развој поља плесне уметности, као и утицаји у употреби појма савремени плес последње деценије и по у Македонији. Кореографи и организације које су утицале на развој плесне уметности анализирани су кроз друштвено-политички преглед контекста и њихових међународних односа (стр. 135-141).

Поглавље 5. Извођење теоретских алата - *Независни сектор као потенцијал за ново моделирање,* показује како се претходно представљени теоријски алати могу користити у одређеним акцијама савременог сценског система уметности, нарочито на независној сцени или приликом самоорганизованих акција. Компаративна анализа изведена је на примерима организација у независном сектору културе (оквири организације, протоколи рада, структуре одлучивања, произведене вредности, процедуре у раду, услови рада и њиховог утицаја на друштвену стварност). Поред тога, анализирани су: организациони формат који ове иницијативе користе за своје активности; оквири сарадње и размене, као и нови методолошки приступи у развоју модела управљања. Полазиште ових анализа је тврдња да ове методе и скуп радних пракси имају потенцијал да се адаптирају и повезују као системи који производе нову институционалну парадигму (самоорганизовани системи, хетерогени менаџмент, производња друштвености, колаборативни модел, ко-институција, пост-институција и пост-менаџерска парадигма су поново предложени и повезани као они који долазе из независног сектора као део цивилног друштва). У делу *5.1 Независне организације као привремене зоне критичког размишљања (студије случаја Македоније и региона бивше*

Југославије) прво се разрађују појмови независне културе и цивилног друштва (Цветичанин, 2009). Да би се идентификовало веће поље у којем ове организације делују, узети су и други текстови Цветичанина (2014), у којима се користи Бурдијеов концепт *'поља'* да се анализира поље културне продукције у Србији. У Бурдијеовом теоријском систему, појам *поља* је моћнији од институције и значи друштвени контекст, специфичну, релативно аутономну конфигурацију друштвених односа у којима се одвијају праксе. Цветичанин (2014) узима ове анализе јер је појам поља веома функционалан у анализи културне продукције независне сцене, а где граничне линије нису јасне. Такође, поље приказује конфликтни карактер друштва или неслагање, док се постојање институција заснива на идеји о *друштвеном консензусу*. Поље је арена за неслагања где је борба између утврђених актера који су власници већине капитала и прате *конзервативне стратегије*, и оних са којима се суочавају и прате *субверзивне стратегије.* Кроз различите карактеристике *поља* отвара се перспектива да независне културне организације у цивилном сектору могу бити лоциране на пољу *ограничене производње* која има логику да побољша експеримент и иновације (авангарда). Ауторка тврди да су прогресивни приступи могући у *ограниченом пољу производње* или на пољу која тежи аутономији у којој су принципи сами себи омогућени актерима, или по Шејковим речима, постоји могућност самоинституције. Савремена позоришна сцена као једна, представља мали део целокупног независног сектора у уметности и култури. Студија Предрага Цветичанина (2009) прави класификацију кључних играча / актера културне политике у земљама бивше Југославије (Србија, Црна Гора и Македонија) које делују изван система јавних / културних институција, да би мерио њихове капацитете, мапирао и проценио њихову моћ и почео процес умрежавања међу тим актерима (стр. 149). Студија помиње три карактеристике оперативног контекста неинституционалних актера у Србији, Црној

Гори и Македонији: *политизација културе, њена нормативна нерегулација и нестабилност* (Цветичанин, 2009, стр. 7). Појам `независни сектор у култури`, у овој тези, односи се на оне *организације чији чланови професионално раде и зарађују за живот у НВО сектору*. Они деле сличне приступе у организовању и деле сличне филозофије пословања као и вредности које производе кроз своје активности примењујући 'стратегије квалитета' (Драгићевић Шешић и Драгојевић 2005): стратегије умрежавања, сарадње, партнерства, савеза за заступање, међусекторска сарадња, као стратегије које би побољшале стварање *културе квалитета*. Даље је дат преглед *општих праваца развоја културне политике у Македонији у протеклих 10 година*, као и општи контекст партизације, имплицитне цензуре, централизације, клијентелизма итд. Прошла година донела је промене јавној политици према цивилном друштву, а неки их могу видети и као *културализацију политике* или стварање новог постполитичког стања кроз различите утицаје кроз фондације, интернационализацију културних политика итд. што унапређује *културни меркантилизам* стварањем трендова, комодификацијом услуга и производа, маргинализујући *културни функционализам* као модел који би побољшао културни развој (Драгићевић, Шешић и Драгојевић, 2005, стр. 20). У делу *5.2 Анализа независног сектора културе у региону, - нова тактика и стратегије,* ауторка уводи налазе из интервјуа са представницима цивилног сектора из региона, дајући преглед нових стратегија и тактике рада цивилног сектора, као и процедура и вредности. Анализирају се појмови: процедуре и платформе који ће касније бити представљени студијама случаја. У делу *5.2.1 Нове тактике и стратегије развоја на независној културној сцени,* аутор уводи независне организације у Македонији кроз перспективу "потреба простора". Ауторка идентификује (период 2000-2010) две стратегије развоја организација у независном сектору - једна је *стварање нових простора*, а друга је *стварање привремених платформи* унутар

институција. У делу *5.2.1.1 Стварање нових простора - побољшање видљивости независног сектора*, описано је да су организације које су биле оријентисане *на стварање нових простора*, користиле ову стратегију за развој својих програма у покушају превазилажења неизвесности у односима са јавним институцијама као просторима где се програми могу приказати. Такође, оне су се супротстављале интернализацији критике, да омогуће самопарезију или оно што Фуко назива *'праксама самоформације'*, али такође можемо видети да постоје покушаји да се интернализују програми у институцијама (стр. 161). У Македонији је представљено више простора и приступа, као и анализа њихових стратегија и утицаја (стр. 161-170). У делу *5.2.1.2 Привремене платформе са институцијама,* представљене су стратегије и методологије рада организација које нису везане за стварање физичких простора, већ привремени вишак у установљени институционални контекст. У делу *5.3 Анализе и исходи оба приступа* (стратегије стварања простора и привремених платформи), анализиран је однос појмова самопарезије или парезије. Такође, анализирани су *Нови стратешки приступи - наслеђе претворено у нове приступе и стратешке савезе - мрежни и сувладни модели* (кроз студије случаја и анализе). Дискутована је Национална стратегија развоја културе за период 2013-2017 године, која је предвидела формирање новог модела културних политика у Македонији а што је утицало на развој сцене, као и на сарадничке формате и савезе у Македонији. То је био веома трауматичан период за независну културну сцену у Македонији. У периоду после 2000-их било је одређених покушаја да се изгради критична сфера у којој се могу артикулисати савремена уметност или социо-културни садржаји у две категорије нових организационих и институционалних модела. Први приступ - нове заједнице које постају чврсте око реформе простора; други приступ - нова заједница која се чврсто везује око заједничких циљева кроз успостављање званичних удружења, са новим

моделима управљања, јасном структуром и развијеним стратегијама. На крају поглавља дата је табела општих политика у стварању и развоју независног сектора у Македонији од независности.

У следећем поглављу **6. Културне политике иницране од уметника против политике иницране одозго-доле**, прво се даје општи преглед политика ЕУ и бивше Југославије за плес и перформанс, као и перспективе о разликама између политике западних извођачких уметности и оних које су аутори Смитхуијсен и Вермеулен називали "посткомунистичким" у земљама Централне и Источне Европе. Политике "смањивања дуализма" означавају процесе и трендове који су се појавили у Европи од почетка деведесетих година прошлог века, када је у средњој и источној Европи политика финансирања била усмерена ка великим репертоарским позориштима а независан сектор био маргинализован или врло мало подржан. У западној Европи ситуација се разликује јер се различите институције и иницијативе подржавају, од националних центара до приватних ансамбала, продуцентских кућа и стамбених простора до малог, експерименталног и независног сектора. Од пада Берлинског зида 1989. године и на истоку су извршене промене, разне политичке трансформације, разбијање хомогене политике прошлости. Овде се говори и о томе како европске политике, или оне које ЕУ имплицира, утичу на национални контекст у бившој Југославији. У делу *6.2 Заговарање на регионалном нивоу и плесна политика у Македонији,* наведене су акције које су утицале на одређене реформе попут колаборативних пројеката чији је циљ да унапређују развој, као што је Номадска плесна академија. Македонска политика културе, посебно плес, евалуирана је кроз политику радних права слободних уметника и како они утичу на развој савременог плеса и кореографије који се још увијек налазе само на независној културној сцени. Такође, нова *Национална стратегија за културни развој Републике Македоније 2018* -

2022 и њена тенденција ка "индустрији искуства" или покушаја да се уравнотеже политике, истичући задатак профитабилности установа и сектора као жељени правац развоја. Игнорисање независног сектора омогућава социјалну искљученост и штити "нормализацију претварања" по речима Исабеле Лораи. Стога се овде анализирају могући ефекти таквих политика, као и иницијативе које се односе на просторе стваралаштва (Иницијатива асоцијације *Акт за независно позориште*, за формирање Топлоцентрале - Центар за савремену уметност и синергију - Центар за савремене сценске уметности у Бугарској; иницијатива оснивања јавне установе или института за савремени плес у Словенији; иницијатива за простор заснован на заступању и заштити "куће" савремене плесне сцене, Магацин у Србији, итд.). У поглављу *6.3 Израда и развој културне политике,* полази се од *партиципативне методологије израда политика,* да би се објаснили модели засновани на овој методологији. Као основе узимани су хрватски примери и разумевање партиципативног управљања у концепту културе; конститутивни, стратешки и оперативни елементи и модели међусобно су повезивани кроз три главна сектора: *јавни*, *цивилни*, и *приватни*. Законодавне основе овог модела објашњавају се кроз анализе македонског Закона о јавном и приватном партнерству, Закона о култури, као и Закона о јавним институцијама, те Закона о локалним властима, као и њихове међусобне везе и могуће ефекте, показујући да је јавно приватно партнерство у *Македонији мешани или хибридни модел*. У формирању модела нове институције уведен је policy приступ па је у потпоглављу *Заједничка политика за нову јавну културу или од патерналистичке институције до (пост)модерне институције* представљен приступ *заједничких политика (*Драгићевић Шешић 2006) као методолошки приступ у партиципативној изградњи нових јавних политика које утичу на (ре)формисање институција или културне сфере. *Заједничке политике* морају бити засноване на *заједничким визијама и циљевима* који би

превазишли или разбили етноцентризам, било какве предрасуде и ксенофобију, а такав приступ се предлаже као предуслов за стварање било каквих реформи културног система, јавних простора у култури у чему лежи будућност културног развоја сваке земље, регије и града. Овим се предвиђа начин креирања културне политике унутар ЕУ - територијално конципираног принципа културне политике или територијалне (државне) концептуализоване/мотивисане културне политике (Драгићевић Шешић и Драгојевић, 2006) који ставља грађанина и целу територију једне земље у центар пажње. То је нарочито важан приступ у македонском етноцентричном контексту, контексту заснованом на етнички усмереним политикама. Даје се друга перспектива јавно-приватног партнерства, (или јпп), укључујући три сектора јавни, приватни, грађански као део приступа заједничких политика. Представљена је шема (Драгићевић Шешић 2006) са позитивним аспектима доприноса сва три сектора у креирању политика и пракси. У делу *Од заједничких политика и партиципативног управљања до ризоматског управљања и институционалног модела,* ауторка предлаже *ризоматско управљање,* као део *"институције као друштвеног агенса"* и који карактерише "непрестано успостављање веза између семиотских ланаца, организација моћи и околности у односу на уметност, науке и друштвене борбе" (Deleuze и Guattari, 2004). Такав приступ заснован је на *комуналном или заједничком управљању* новим моделима и треба да донесе *хетерогеност активног поновног замишљања институција*, као саставни део *пост-менаџерске парадигме*, или *перспектива теорије пост-модерне организације. Он* дозвољава нове вредности и нове изразе креативности, идентитета, толеранције, рада, сарадње, међузависности и солидарности, оне које су старе (метрополитанске) културе биле потиснуле или демонтирале у корист хијерархија, централности, супремације, искључености, трења, чишћења или чак и истребљења других. (Катунарић, 2005).

Последње поглавље **7. Институција извођачке уметности - агент друштвених и политичких трансформација** представља закључак, сублимацију и оправдање циља тезе, разрађивање концепта институције као продукције друштвености или агенса за социјалне и политичке трансформације. Ауторка даје и преглед тренутне ситуације институција извођачких уметности с намером да оправда циљ тезе и најављује предложени модел као студију случаја, наглашавајући потребу новог приступа у управљању организацијом и теорији у културном контексту.

Предложени приступ ове тезе ка моделовању нове институције као простора инклузије, посредника промене друштвене и политичке средине укључује стратешки приступ концептуализовања институције као простора заједничког, друштвеног релевантног и контекстуализованог, или институција као посредника друштвене и политичке промене које на културу гледају као на ресурс за развој јавне сфере. На крају се предлаже и правац концептуализације институције као институције грађана, као алтернатива доминантној комодификацији, експлоатацији и приватизацији јавних ресурса и добара, где је управљање трансформацијска моћ друштвених односа, јер се односи на *колективну одговорност, партиципативно управљање и заједничку одговорност према јавним добрима. Ризоматско* управљање 'заједничком институцијом' или 'посредником за друштвено-политичке промене' захтева колективно или заједничко руковођење, сарадњу, ко-менторинг, колаборативна истраживања, ко-кураторство и тако даље, јер само кроз овакав приступ можемо превладати кризе или испробати нове методолошке принципе. Отвара се постменаџерска и постинституционална парадигма, подржана постмодерном теоријом организације и другим теоријским перспективама представљеним кроз ову тезу. Размишљање о институцији и институционалним праксама и њиховим потенцијалима, као заједнички управљан простор, простор заједничког, може бити нова менаџерска логика заснована

на партиципативном или ризоматском управљању која нам омогућава да цртамо различите мапе или да будемо у средини, замишљајући и претраживајући различита значења унутар позоришта, плеса и друге уметности. Оваква пост-управљачка парадигма може се подржати курирањем као методом изградње садржаја који се пружа институцијама извођачких уметности, како би се редефинисала и контекстуализирала већ хомогенизована идеја о институцији, традиционални приступ репертоару, или подстакнути естетски импулс.

То је предлог да се размишља о новој политици кустосирања или стварању садржаја у институцијама извођачких уметности. Циљ је видети кустосирање као хетерогеност у програмирању, приближавању, управљању, размишљању, разматрању, рефлектовању, глуми, наступању или као рефлексији уметничке праксе и културе, радним и производним условима, економији, друштвено-политичком и културном окружењу, и друге институционалне структуре које утичу на област извођачких уметности. Овим се предлаже кустосирање као активистичка пракса, тактика која омогућава видљивост разлика у извођачкој уметности, хетерогености, гдје кустоска пракса и кустоси извођачких уметности могу бити "посредници". (стр. 244-245).

Теза се завршава предлогом о томе шта треба да буде простор/институција: посредник друштвених и политичких трансформација или активни стваралац друштвене заједнице? *И мислим на* - примарни рад Младена Стилиновића - "Све што видимо, такође би могло бити другачије (Моје слатко мало јагње)", показује да је овакав приступ један од многих. Перспектива дата кроз ову тезу једна је од теоретски подржаних приступа, мапа мисли и искустава. Може бити и других погледа и методолошких приступа у размишљању о институцијама у култури и у извођачким уметностима. Академска истраживања, као и свакодневни рад на терену, захтевају да наставимо да покушавамо да развијемо теорије, да замишљамо, размишљамо,

курирамо, управљамо, да успостављамо просторе за уметност, извођачке уметности, са неуспехом или успехом, али да се никад не одричемо покушаја промене и стварање бољег окружења у којем стварамо и радимо у уметности и култури. У том смислу на крају дисертације се налази студија случаја Кино Култура - простор за савремене извођачке уметности и културу, а рад се стандардно завршава библиографијом и биографијом ауторке.

Biography

Biljana Tanurovska-Kjulavkovski

Email: biljana.tanurovska@gmail.com;

Telephone: +389 75 299 888

Biljana Tanurovska - Kjulavkovski, is a cultural manager and a curator in the field of contemporary performing arts. In 2007, she finished her M.Sc. in Interculturalism, Cultural Management and Cultural Policy at the University of Arts in Belgrade, and in 1998, she was awarded her BA in History of Art and Archaeology, at the University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius, Skopje. She took part in numerous international educational programs and residences.

She is co-founder of NGO Lokomotiva - Center for new initiatives in art and culture from Skopje, and the regional platform Nomad Dance Academy. Since 2003, she has been working at Lokomotiva, Skopje, as manager and program director. From 1996 to 2001, she was engaged as a freelance coordinator for several projects, including several theater productions, as well as production of several film projects, assistant director, director of directors, and other. From 2001 to 2003, she was working as a project manager at the Multimedia Center of Skopje. From 2008 to 2010, she was engaged as a consultant and evaluator of a grant program at the European Foundation for Culture in Amsterdam. In 2008/9, as part of the British Council team, she worked as a consultant for the project "Mapping the Creative Industries" - a project of the British Council and the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Macedonia. From 2005 to 2008, she worked at the Euro Balkan Institute of the Center for Visual and Cultural Research as a junior researcher.

As part of the NOMAD Dance Academy (NDA), platform for regional cooperation in contemporary dance and performing arts, she has been a member of the coordinating body and the decision-making body since 2006. From 2012 to 2017, she was a member of the board of JADRO - Association of independent cultural scene. In 2015, with Lokomotiva and in cooperation with the Navigator Theater Cvetko, she founded the project space KINO KULTURA - space for contemporary performing arts and contemporary culture.

She has initiated, curated, and managed various projects and programs related to the contemporary performing arts, cultural policy, international collaboration, and so on. As part of the NDA's activities in 2010, she participated in researching and producing reports and recommendations on cultural policies in theater and dance in the countries of the region, available for public use on the website of Lokomotiva. As part of the research team of Lokomotiva, in partnership with the Center for Development of the Pelagonija region in Macedonia and the informal culture network of the Pelagonija region, (within the framework of the Program for decentralized cooperation between Lower Normandy and Macedonia), she created the Strategy for Cultural Development of the Pelagonia Region 2013- 2016. As part of Lokomotiva, she managed various interenational collaborations, among which the EU project Jardin D'Europe EU project 2008-2013, EU project Long Life Burning. As part of Lokomotiva, she is representative in GPS – Global Practice Sharing –/collaborative exchange/ a platform for the international exchange of ideas, processes, and reflective practices surrounding dance and movement based forms between the U.S. and the independent performing arts communities internationally.

She was an assistant curator in the international project "Curatorial Translation", co-curator of the Locomotion – Festival for contemporary art and performance in Skopje, Macedonia (2008-2015). She curates the program Platform(a) for contemporary performing arts as part of Kino Kultura, and the theoretical and educational platform Art Politics Institution and

Body. She is engaged in the latest projects Dissonant co- spaces 2016/7, Cultural spaces for active citizents 2017/18, dealing with the issues of politicality and of public spaces, heterogeneity in institutional models in culture and their role in the public sphere. As part of these projects, she programmed the international conference "Modelling public space(s) in culture" held in Skopje, in October 2017. In 2017, she was engaged as a mentor on the project The Perfect Artist, A discursive-educational program as part of the Denes Award, organized by FRU. At present, she is engaged in the team that develops methodology for cultural policy development of the City of Skopje.

She collaborates with the curator Ivana Vaseva, and together they developed one concept discussion *How to make a festival of 1000 and 1.000.000 euros*, that was presented on numerous festivals and spaces in Europe. Also, they developed a lecture performance *Cultural workers take a stage*, dealing with the workers' rights on the independent cultural scene.

She participated in conferences among which, 2018 – Theatre between politics and policies, Belgrade, Faculty of Drama Arts, 23-25.03.2018; 2017- Participatory Governance in Culture Conference/Participatory Governance in Culture: Exploring Practices, Theories and Policies. Do It Together, 22nd - 24th November 2017, Rijeka, Croatia, discussion "New Horizons of Public Culture: Which Type of Institutional Practices Do We Need?"; 2017 – Art, Politics and the Institution - A European Summit, at the International Festival for Performance-Art & Networking 14. – 24. September 2017 in Mannheim; 2016- participant/presenter/moderator on the BITEF festival conference: BITEF and cultural diplomacy: theater and geopolitics; 1, 2 October, 2016.

She also participated in different presentation and discussion panels: 2017, Malta Festival Poznań, part of the program Balkan Platforms curated by Oliver Frljić and Goran Injac, June;

2017- 16.-18.11/ Taarnby Torv festival, Copenhagen, Panelist on the discussion „Experiences from the spaces of performing arts as spaces for citizens and art"; 2017 – Conference ENROUTE- for contemporary movements in the Balkans, Tanzquartier Vienna, March; 2017- Conference "Working together transnationally", K3 |Tanzplan Hamburg, March; 2017 – Moderating and presentation on Symposium CRISIS? WHAT CRISIS?! talking about Dance & Aesthetic – Dance & Labour – Dance & Politics, ImpulsTanz, Vienna, 11-14 August; 2014 - participant/presenter on the conferences: Balkans: Public Debate "Art meets Theory in Collective Action", Athens, Onassis Centre, 16 March; 2014;/ participant/presenter at the conferences: Kulturologue: Evaluation of Cultural Policies and EU-Funded Programmes as Promoters of Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue in the Balkans/Southeast Europe (SEE).

She teaches project management, strategic development, performing arts management, cultural policy and models of regional collaboration, curating in performing arts within workshops in Macedonia and the Balkan region. Since 2011, she she has been teaching two subjects, management of performing arts and theoretical discourses in contemporary dance as an external collaborator / lecturer within the Faculty of Music Arts, Department of Ballet Pedagogy, contemporary dance.

She has published texts in magazines, publications, and books, and co-edited several publications/books. Selected: co-editor: „Modelling public space(s) in culture - Rethinking Institutional Practices in Culture and Historical (Dis)continuities", publication, Lokomotiva, Skopje, 2018, co-editor; text: The "Other" Body: Mapping the Archives of Choreographic Practices in Macedonia (1970 -1990), Dimitrov Slavcho and Tanurovska – Kjulavkovski, in Maska – journal for performing arts, Ljubljana 2017; text: Cultural diplomacy, a dialog with the civil society, in Cultural Diplomacy, Arts Festivals and Geopolitics, edited by Milena Dragićević Šesic, with Ljiljana Rogac Mijatovic, Nina Mihaljinac, Belgrade 2017; text:

Independent Performing Arts Scene, Biljana Tanurovska - Kjulavkovski, in Platform, East European Performing arts Companion, Edited by JoannaKrakowska and Daria Odija, The Centre for Culture in Lublin, the City of Lublin and the Adam Mickiewicz Institute, 2016. pg. 240, 2016; Современоста и капитализација на современата изведбена уметност/ Трендови или реформулирање на моделитетите, (Contemporality and capitalisation of contemporary performance art _Trends or reformulation of modalities), Биљана Тануровска Ќулавковски во АРС АКАДЕМИКА- Меѓународно списание за изведувачки уметности бр. 2, Скопје 2014 (Biljana Tanurovska Kjulavkovski in Ars Academica – International magazine for performing arts, 2, Skopje 2014; The Festival as a “Microphysics of Power” (Foucault)”, Biljana Tanurovska Kjulavkovski, Elena Veljanovska and Ivana Vaseva, published in: Parallel Slalom, A lexicon of non-aligned poetics, ed. Bojana Cvejic, Goran Sergej Pristas, Walking Theory – TkH, Belgrade and CDU- Centre for Drama Arts, Zagreb, p. 354; Balkany Performatywne, Rytual, Dramat, sztuka w przestrezeni publicznej, Uniwersytet Opolski, Opole 2013; and other.

Изјава о ауторству

Потписана Биљана Тануровска Кјулавковски

Изјављујем,

да је докторска дисертација под насловом

Theory of institutions and cultural policies for contemporary performative practices - *Институционална теорија и културна политика у савременој перформативној пракси*

- резултат сопственог истраживачког / уметничког истраживачког рада,
- да предложена докторска теза у целини ни у деловима није била предложена за добијање било које дипломе према студијским програмима других факултета,
- да су резултати коректно наведени и
- да нисам кршила ауторска права и користила интелектуалну својину других лица.

Потпис докторанда

У Београду, _____

_____

Изјава о истоветности штампане и електронске верзије докторске дисертације / докторског уметничког пројекта

Име и презиме аутора _Биљана Тануровска Кјулавковски ___

Докторски студијски програм_____

Наслов докторске дисертације

Theory of institutions and cultural policies for contemporary performative practices - *Институционална теорија и културна политика у савременој перформативној пракси*

Ментор _____ Професор, Др Милена Драгићевић Шешић

Потписани (име и презиме аутора) Биљана Тануровска Кјулавковски

изјављујем да је штампана верзија моје докторске дисертације истоветна електронској верзији коју сам предала за објављивање на порталу **Дигиталног репозиторијума Универзитета уметности у Београду.**

Дозвољавам да се објаве моји лични подаци везани за добијање академског звања доктора наука, као што су име и презиме, година и место рођења и датум одбране рада.

Ови лични подаци могу се објавити на мрежним страницама дигиталне библиотеке, у електронском каталогу и у публикацијама Универзитета уметности Београду.

Потпис докторанда

У Београду, _____

_____

Изјава о коришћењу

Овлашћујем Универзитет уметности у Београду да у Дигитални репозиторијум Универзитета уметности унесе моју докторску дисертацију под називом:

Theory of institutions and cultural policies for contemporary performative practices - *Институционална теорија и културна политика у савременој перформативној пракси* која је моје ауторско дело.

Докторску дисертацију предала сам у електронском формату погодном за трајно депоновање.

У Београду, _____ Потпис докторанда

_____