ARTICLES

PASCAL GIELEN
ANTWERP RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE ARTS
UNIVERSITY OF ANTWERP, BELGIUM

THIJS LIJSTER
DEPARTMENT OF ARTS, CULTURE AND MEDIA STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN, HOLLAND

ART AND CIVIL ACTION. CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE EUROPEAN CIVIL DOMAIN

ABSTRACT

In this article, the place of new cultural organizations in the civil domain is analysed. The authors describe a theoretical model that they call the 'civil chain', describing the different phases in which civil organizations develop themselves. The civil chain delivers analytic insights into the origin of typical problems of contemporary civil actions and movements, such as the sustainability of civil organizations and the globalization of the public sphere. Using this theoretical model in two case-studies (Les Têtes de l'Art in Marseille and Culture 2 Commons in Zagreb), they demonstrate how cultural practices and artistic tools play an increasingly important role in civil practices, which are becoming more and more hybrid.

PASCAL GIELEN

Pascal Gielen is full professor of Sociology of Art and Politics at the Antwerp Research Institute for the Arts

(Antwerp University, Belgium) where he leads the Culture Commons Quest Office (CCQO). Gielen is editor in-chief of the international book series Arts in Society. In 2016, he became laureate of the Odysseus grant for excellent international scientific research of the Fund for Scientific Research Flanders in Belgium. His research focuses on creative labour, the institutional context of the arts and on cultural politics. Gielen has published many books which have been translated in English, Korean, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish and Turkish.
Contact the author at: *Pascal.gielen@uantwerpen.be*

THIJS LIJSTER

Thijs Lijster is assistant professor of Philosophy of Art and Culture at the Department of Arts, Culture and Media studies of the University of Groningen, and postdoctoral researcher at the Culture Commons Quest Office of the University of Antwerp. He wrote *Benjamin and Adorno on Art and Art Criticism. Critique of Art* (AUP 2017), and co-edited *Spaces for Criticism. Shifts in Contemporary Art Discourses* (Valiz 2015). He received the Dutch/Flemish Prize for Young Art Criticism in 2010, and the NWO/Boekman dissertation award in 2015.
Contact the author at: *t.e.lijster@rug.nl*

INTRODUCTION

In modern Europe, cultural organizations such as museums, theatres and opera houses have played a decisive role in the constitutive process of a civil society. Most of these institutions constructed a cultural hierarchy in the context of a nation state through familiar processes of socialization and canonization. Quite a few of the publicly funded institutions, for example in the relatively young states across Central and Eastern Europe and the EU Neighbourhood still exemplify this traditional role of culture in the construction of (new) national identities.

Over the past thirty years, however, several developments have begun to side-line or even discredit the traditional role of these established art institutions. On the one hand, democratization processes in the field of culture questioned this top-down 'civilizing' process in which the elite promotes its own 'high' culture as the only good culture, wherein the masses should be initiated and educated. On the other hand, globalization – the combined process of a diversification of culture through migration and the homogenization and internationalization of culture through mass consumption – puts pressure on what has been traditionally considered to be part of the established cultural canon of a nation state. These historical evolutions cause a crisis in the legitimization of the classic role of public art institutions.

Over almost the same past thirty years, however, everywhere in Europe and its neighbourhood new civic initiatives in the arts and independently operating cultural organizations have emerged. Today, public and private arts funding bodies all over Europe witness the emergence of organizations and activity profiles that reach even beyond this 'classic' distinctions between public/commercial/independent. Cultural organizations increasingly do not follow the non-profit/public-funded/commercial producer logic anymore but increasingly seem to deliver a hybrid mix of voluntary or self-funded initiatives, subsidized art projects and (community) services that can even blend in with offering commercial productions in a variety of activity fields. Many of these new cultural initiatives differ in at least two ways from the former type of established art institutions: 1) they no longer refer to a national culture or artistic canon, and 2) they mostly lack hierarchical or rigid organizational structures. Considering the first difference: cultural organizations have evolved from producing artistic content (visual arts, theatre, new media, literature, et cetera) to offering cultural/creative projects as a new type of social initiative that serve the wider public

good (e.g. community development projects, new social/cultural venues, youth work and well-being of specific groups, cultural education, et cetera). Others have started to develop cultural strategies for activist civil society agendas or advocacy goals that tackle much larger policy issues beyond the arts as such (e.g. citizen participation, urban development, public space, environmental issues, democratization, social inclusion, EU affairs, et cetera). The working strategies of cultural organizations increasingly seem to be aimed at realizing project-like actions or providing creative services that address global challenges or tackle community issues (or both in combination). They seem to extend towards new creative working areas where they explore 'glocally' relevant themes that often lead them to actions far outside of the immediate arts and culture sector environments (De Cauter et alii 2010, De Bruyne & Gielen 2011, Gielen 2015b).

Considering the second difference – the lack of hierarchical organizational structures – we can observe how across the cultural sector management practices and working structures seem to become much more fluid than the structured organizational models and strategic hierarchies that characterize most of the traditional arts institutions. Long-term strategic plans seem to be increasingly replaced by a shared creation of general organizational value frameworks. These provide an overall strategic orientation point for the organization while ideally creating room for individual pilot initiatives and experimentation. Many new cultural initiatives today remain rather small and informal. They build temporary alliances with other like-minded initiatives in order to pursue shared strategic goals or to share knowledge, resources, and ideas for tackling similar cultural questions and artistic working fields. The cultural field is increasingly characterized by rhizome-like network structures.

All these individual characteristics of these new civic initiatives have strategic and structural consequences. 1) Most of these organizations work on a local level, and engage themselves in the first place with a local or regional civil society. At the same time, we see them developing large pan-European and international networks with like-minded peers to exchange information and knowledge. 2) Most of the initiatives seem to have a temporary, less sustainable character and operate in a tactical rather than a strategic mode. Public arts funding mechanisms, but international philanthropy as well, have hardly yet recognized such trends towards strategic hybridization and structural liquefaction.

In this article we investigate what new civil practices and strategic roles cultural organizations have adopted for operating at the intersection of creative production and for pursuing wider goals of relevance in their working environment and societies, based on a pilot research commissioned by the European Cultural Foundation (ECF) into two projects funded by them: Les Têtes de l'Art in Marseille and Culture 2 Commons in Zagreb. How do these cultural organizations define their own civil role? What new structural setups do they form? Could their practices and organizational models provide valuable insights on the civil role of the arts? And, last but not least, (how) do they give shape to a transnational, in this case European, civil space beyond the traditional national territory?

To answer these questions, we will first (section 2) take a brief look at our basic concepts, most notably 'civil society' and 'civil action', as well as elaborate on our understanding of culture. Here we will also discuss the methodology of our empirical research. Next (section 3) we will introduce our conceptual model, which we have named the 'civil chain', in order to capture the logic of civil action and how it is organized. This model will then be used to analyse the case studies in Marseille (section 4) and Zagreb (section 5): how do these organizations intertwine cultural practices and civil actions? How do they understand their own civil role? Finally (section 6), we return to the question of the place of cultural organizations in the European civil domain, and what we might learn from them.

THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

Cohen and Arato define civil society as "a sphere of social interaction between economy and state, composed above all of the intimate sphere (especially the family), the sphere of associations (especially voluntary associations), social movements, and forms of public communication" (1992, ix). A crucial part of civil society is the 'public sphere' (analysed most famously by Habermas, 1989), the realm where citizens can freely discuss and exchange ideas and opinions concerning the true, the good, and the beautiful, thus laying the foundation for democratic decision-making. We might formulate the difference as follows: civil society is the organized whole of values and interests in a given society, as expressed in collective institutions and organizations; the public sphere is the public communication of and negotiation about ideas, arguments, opinions, expressions, and emotions concerning

these values and how society is organized. Civil *action*, then, describes how individuals translate their particular interests and emotions into matters of public concern.

A notable problem, which we will return to later, is that the traditional conceptual framings of civil society and public sphere from Hegel up until Habermas were focused mainly on the national level. This framing is up for discussion now that social, political, and cultural issues increasingly go beyond the scope of the nation state (Walzer 1995, Koopmans & Statham 2010, Fraser et alii 2014). Globalization forces us to re-evaluate the notions of civil society and civil action, and raises questions concerning the possibility of a transnational (and for the present project in particular: pan-European) public sphere, which would be crucial for democratic deliberation on an international level. Although this issue does not play a central part in this article, we will come back to it in our concluding section.

Since we are talking about *cultural* organizations here we should also elaborate on our understanding of the term 'culture'. As we did in previous research (Gielen & Lijster 2015), we build on the work of Belgian sociologist Rudi Laermans, who defined culture in a broad anthropological sense as "a socially shared reservoir or repertoire of signs" (2002). Culture is, then, first of all about the semiotic process of signs, assigning meaning (signification) and being able to do so. To Laermans' definition we add that culture is not only about a formal semiotic play but also about signification in the sense of giving 'meaning' to life. The use of signs to give meaning to oneself and one's environment is very much an affect-charged process. Stated rather solemnly: culture always also concerns questions about the meaning of life and just as much about the meaning of one's family, friends, colleagues, city, region or nation. From this extended definition, we were able to argue that culture is in fact the basis or foundation of all societies. All human practices depend on assigning meaning, after all. How we trade, but also how we make laws or define rights and civil rights has everything to do with how we assign meaning. Likewise, everything about how we see an abstract space like Europe, is the result of processes of assigning meaning and 'sense'.

To observe organizations from a cultural point of view also means paying particular attention to these processes of assigning meaning. This process of meaning giving is of course laden with power relations and ideological structures (Hall 1986, Williams 1995).

We assume that cultural organizations in particular play a crucial role in these processes, as they have all the means at their disposal to 'signify' civil interests. They can even play their part in the battle to define what is civil and what is not. In line with our definition of culture, we will not limit ourselves to a semantic analysis: it is precisely the affects that are expressed in morality, values, and ethics that are of interest to us.

Finally, the definition of culture mentioned above demonstrates that we do not reduce culture to art or Culture with a capital C. That does not alter the fact that we will pay attention to the functioning of art and aesthetic design in adopting a civil role. This is because we suspect that artistic expression has a particular quality of expressing feelings that are at the roots of civil action. As a specific form of assigning meaning, art may therefore play a vital part in the conversion from a negative emotion to the positive energy needed for civil action. Besides, artistic forms of expression provide the chance for alternative forms of rationalization, communication, and organization. After all, as the cliché has it, art expresses exactly that of which one cannot speak. This popular notion aside, we know only too well how easily images and music can reach out to a wide audience and bring masses into action. Perhaps more than words (and most certainly more than scientific articles) they have the mobilizing potential to make an idea catch on, to make people engage in civil action. But art can be more than just a mobilizing force. It is first and foremost imagination and as we know, quite a few artists have used that capacity of the imagination for much more than expressing their most private fantasies. Quite often they also create a possibly different world, for example by showing that social interaction can take place in a completely different way than was thought of before. Or they make it heard, seen, and felt how a dominant political regime would work out if we would radically think through certain positive or negative aspects of it. Works of art often do create both utopia and dystopia. As audiences, we understand only too well that we are in a world of fiction, but it is precisely this transference to an imaginary world that provides us with the possibility to look at the non-fictional world or simply everyday reality from a completely different perspective. We may expect that this fresh but sometimes strange perspective will at times feed political and civil ambitions, although this remains a hypothesis for now.

In order to analyse the way cultural organizations become part of and/or intervene in civil society, we devel-

oped a model we have called the 'civil chain', describing the different phases of civil organizations' development. This model will be discussed in the next section. The civil chain delivers analytic insights into the origin of typical problems of contemporary civil actions and movements, such as the sustainability of civil organizations and the globalization of the public sphere. We used this model as a guide for the empirical research into our cases. However, we did not want to start off from a predefined – and all too rigid – definition of what a 'civil role' should be. On the contrary, we also wanted to look at how these cultural organizations themselves define their civil mission. Our model functioned as a lens through which to 'observe' these organizations, while the empirical research (existing of in-depth interviews with key actors and document analysis) provided opportunities to 'refine' or qualify the characteristics of civil roles. We call this approach in our own terms 'performative research'; we take as our starting point the interaction or dialectic between theoretical concepts and empirical findings, 'testing', as it were, the performance of our concepts in practice. The empirical part of the research was conducted between November 2015 and February 2016, by means of a questionnaire (based on the model of the 'civil chain') that functioned as guide for in-depth interviews with key actors, as well as an analysis of relevant documents provided by the organizations themselves.[1]

THE CIVIL CHAIN AND THE ORIGIN OF CIVIL ACTION

According to Manuel Castells (2015) civil action is born from emotion. Although such actions always imply the hopeful expectation that something in society can be improved, this first emotion is often of a negative nature, fed by fear, discomfort or at least irritation. The reasons for this can be manifold. An individual may feel threatened by beggars or by drug dealers hanging around in the neighbourhood. But they can also feel ill at ease because there are too many policemen, soldiers or security cameras in the streets. Employees may feel intimidated by their boss or colleagues and may also experience stress because of too much work. Others may be utterly frustrated because their printer is malfunctioning again. In short, feelings of annoyance, irritations, frustration or injustice can have many causes. And, as may be evident from this broad range of examples, certainly not every negative emotional experience leads to civil action. People who experience stress at work can speak to their em-

[1] The field studies were mostly conducted by Maité Juan and Philippe Eynaud in Marseille, and by Philipp Dietachmair in Marseille and Zagreb. We ourselves visited both places only once, mostly to gather some information and do the introductions, as well as to size up the situation in terms of local functioning and context.

ployer or trade union, or can seek professional help or therapy to learn how to cope better with stress.

Discomfort can be channeled in many ways. Those who choose therapy or decide to hire a lawyer opt for a private and individual solution to their problem. Such an initial step undoubtedly requires courage. Discussing our sometimes highly personal and therefore subjective perceptions always assumes the will and courage to communicate. Once that obstacle is overcome we are still not dealing with a civil action yet. Indeed, communication with our therapist or lawyer has little to do with citizenship or public spirit. In order to 'enter' civil society we need to specifically address a collective and generate public support. The initial emotion must be recognized as a shared emotion, as a shared fear, frustration or irritation. Civil action is only possible if we take our personal discomfort out of the private sphere, when we 'de-privatize' the subject matter. However, such a step towards civil space requires an important skill: the ability of (self-)rationalization. *Rationalization* is required to articulate an initial intuition or basic emotion. It is the cognitive competence of analysing one's own feelings and perhaps point out possible causes. Rationalization, and especially self-rationalization, therefore precedes communication, although the causes of certain emotions might be further clarified in dialogue with others.

And finally, after the processes of rationalization, communication and de-privatization, the skill of *organization* is required in order to set the civil action in motion and, if necessary, keep it going in the long run. For instance, one must organize oneself in order to write an opinion piece, but also encourage others to do the same. Protesting in the streets or rolling up our sleeves to clean the neighbourhood requires at least a modicum of (self-)organization. What is important here is that those processes of self-rationalization and self-organization can diminish the initial emotion that initiated them in the first place. For instance, having to find one's way in a maze of legal rules, being obliged to study political procedures, or having to follow the long and winding road through bureaucratic institutions in order to arrive at the right form of (self-)organization can make one lose the energy to go on. Both processes therefore require to literally rationalize the initial emotion, to distance oneself from it and in a sense 'bureaucratize' it (all forms of organization presuppose setting up a minimum number of rules and procedures and sticking to them). In themselves such processes are not dramatic and even necessary to initiate civil ac-

tion. However, this points to the fact that the basic emotion as mentioned determines the 'drive' or the energy of the civil undertaking. Or, in an analogy by Castells: it is an initial fear converted into anger that defines the engine of civil action. It is the steam that powers civil organization or an initiative with a civil mission. This also means that civil action gets its basic energy from very direct, mundane and mostly local human experience. The chances of success and continuance of every civil initiative therefore depend on finding the right balance between rationalizing and organizing on the one hand, and keeping up the energy that is obtained from a basic emotion on the other. This balance is all the more urgent the more cultural organizations 'scale up' their activities, for instance from a local to a regional or from the national to the transnational level. Each step up the ladder demands more rationalization and organization, and thereby one risks seeing the initial drive and emotion evaporate, as well as losing track of the local problems that started it all.

From the above we may conclude that a cultural organization that adopts a civil role situates itself at the end of a chain of successive, distinctive operations, and that such an organization will continuously have to take into account all the previous stages in the chain in order not to alienate itself from its own source of energy. Analytically, this succession of processes – which we call the *civil chain* – looks like this: (1) emotion – (2) (self-)rationalization – (3) communication – (4) de-privatization (or going public) and, finally, (5) (self-)organization.

As stated above, a cultural organization that adopts a civil role finds itself at the end of this chain. It is indeed an *organization*. It only plays a civil role because it de-privatizes or makes public a specific social issue. It can only do so through communication, which it not only needs to publicize its civil mission but also to extend the organization itself, for which communication through its founders, members and other involved parties is necessary. This communication assumes an ability to articulate and thereby rationalize a basic feeling. At the same time, however, it is important to maintain that initial emotion. Necessary processes of rationalization and organization can after all take away the drive and energy from the organization. Precisely for the sake of this 'higher' European goal the three applicable strategies tend to detach an organization from its local issues and therefore also from its unique source of dynamics.

Before looking at empirical reality, let us take one last theoretical look at this proposed civil chain, if only to

further sharpen our look at cultural organizations later on. Looking at the chain analytically, we can see that the civil ambition can only be fulfilled through three transitions. The first one takes place at the emotional level. An initially negative feeling (of discomfort, injustice, etc.) must be converted into a sense of positive energy, of simple enthusiasm to 'get cracking' or at least of not resigning oneself to the situation. Castells gives the example of fear that must be 'positively' converted into outrage and hope (2015, 247-248). By 'positively' we mean that outrage and hope lead to action. However negative the results of bursts of outrage may be, they always indicate an accumulation of energy. Through outrage, the paralyzing effect of fear changes from passive to active. Feelings of discomfort, irritation, insecurity, injustice and the like often result in defeatism or resignation. Especially when people feel they are alone in their efforts, they tend to resign themselves to the situation. Only when a sometimes hard to pinpoint 'spark' turns negative energy into positive energy does civil action become an option. It is from this same emotional transition that a civil organization gets its energy.

A second necessary transition is to be found on the level of communication, as only through communication can a transformation from the individual to the collective level take place. We can, for example, test whether we really feel what we feel by consulting a therapist, in the sense that we can check whether such a professional recognizes our feelings as also occurring in others, or is familiar with them from scientific literature. It is only in that confirmation that an individual problem can become a collective one, in the sense that others share our supposedly individual feeling. In the same sense city dwellers can have a chat with their neighbours about street litter. This is also communication in which a basic experience is shared and tested. Only if a neighbour confirms that: 'Yes, you're right, there is a lot of litter here these days', the feeling of discomfort is collectivized and the possibility of civil action emerges. Organizations that adopt a civil role often originate in such shared sentiments. So, without collectivization there is no civil action and no organization. Both examples of collectivization also illustrate, however, that de-individualization in itself is not enough to speak of civil action.

To do so, requires yet another transition, from the private to the public sphere. As indicated earlier, feelings and issues can be shared and therefore collectivized in both the private and the public sphere. For example,

as long as the employee suffering from stress only discusses the problem with a therapist or only collectivizes it in a self-help group, we cannot speak of a civil action. Only when this worker, perhaps together with the therapist, articulates the initial feeling or syndrome in social terms does it acquire civil value. This means that, say, stress is no longer only explained as a mental condition but is recognized as a structural problem too. Stress is then not only about the irritated nerves of individual employees or about the annoying personality of their boss, but also about, for instance, high work pressure, increasingly precarious working conditions such as flexible and mobile project labour, and the decrease in long-term employment contracts and job security. In other words, in the transition from the private to the public sphere a personal issue (being a stress-sensitive person) is not only translated into a collective problem (a stressful environment, stressful working conditions), but the cause of the problem or feeling of discomfort is also located in broader social phenomena. This is why the transformation from the private to the public sphere implies the *politicization* of the initial feeling. If 'the political' stands for openly shaping our living together, this translation is an appeal to the political to articulate and address the issue. Note: we deliberately speak of 'the political' and not 'politics', as the latter may suggest that the politicization of an emotion would only mean addressing politicians or authorities, while 'the political' is much broader. To paraphrase the French philosopher Jacques Rancière: the political is defined by taking part in living together and in actions that (may) rearrange the relations within a society. The political therefore does not simply coincide with a fixed position within political institutions (parliament, government or political party), but is all about questioning and moving such positions (Rancière 2015, 35-52).

This notion has a bearing on our study object, since it means that any civil action or any civil role adopted by a cultural organization is potentially political in nature. And perhaps here also lies the rarely made distinction between the public sphere as understood by Habermas, and the civil domain. Whereas the former is a space for expressing opinions or views, the latter goes one step further. An opinion piece in a newspaper or a debate among intellectuals remains, after all, too easily confined to the discursive domain of verbal dispute and rhetorical musings. In the civil domain this 'non-commitment' vanishes. There, opinions are linked to political demands and administrative responsibility and will at least stir up or

irritate the political, for example by referring to civil and other rights and obligations related to an expressed opinion. Besides, in the civil domain those responsible can be addressed. Who, for example, should enforce these rights and who should fulfil these obligations? The very moment that answers to these questions are demanded, civil action occurs or transforms the public sphere into a full-fledged civil domain. We may suspect therefore that the cultural organizations with a civil role studied here are specifically intermediating between the public sphere and the civil domain. In that case they also contribute to the process of politicization.

THE ART OF MIRRORING

Les Têtes de l'Art, established in 1996 in Marseille by three actors, in the first place wanted to have a legal structure for their professional concerns. Although Sam Khebizi and his two colleagues Laurent and Lavigne were quite successful as a comic trio, they soon found the theatre scene too confined and self-absorbed. With Les Têtes de l'Art they wanted to build a bridge between the artistic and the social world, or, as they put it, to make the connection with 'the real world'. The latter is regarded as more diverse and therefore more challenging than the traditional art world and its audiences.

When our field researcher Philipp Dietachmair probed a question about an 'initial irritation' or 'emotion' in an in-depth interview with the current director of Les Têtes de l'Art, Khebizi, the latter did vaguely refer to a 'shock' that he experienced as a young resident of Marseille, when he found out that there were still *bidonvilles* (slums) in the city. Perhaps this is just an indicator that informs the social sensibility and fuels Khebizi's and Les Têtes de l'Art's drive. This almost natural link between an individual sensibility like Khebizi's and the organization seems a relevant element. Castells also notes that the basic emotion and drive for civil action often reside with individuals, and that organizations are frequently the result of initiatives by one or a handful charismatic persons (2015, 12-13). More or less durable forms of organization stand on the shoulders of a single individual, which immediately also reveals the potential weakness of such initiatives, as quite a few of them are totally dependent on the person who started them. This figure also embodies a definite but sometimes hard to determine drive.

Khebizi is definitely aware of this 'fragility'. Several times during the interview he states, for example, that Les Têtes should be a structure that could also continue

without him. It is one of the reasons why, after ten years in place, the board of Les Têtes was reshuffled. Khebizi's wife and close friends were replaced by an assembly of artists, which not only makes the organization more professional, but also means that Khebizi must give account of his functioning within a more critical framework. At the same time, we see how the organization rationalizes an initially mostly intuitive way of operating by putting it into words and by formulating a vision in 2008. Khebizi even took a course in management and no longer calls himself, as he did in the beginning, an 'artist' or 'artistic director' but 'managing director'. This also illustrates a tendency towards rationalization, and especially, professionalization. From then on, the people of Les Têtes work more according to plans and more tasks are being delegated within the organization.

Returning to our 'civil chain', we see, on one hand a confirmation of the logic and chronology we have outlined. An admittedly vague basic emotion and personal drive are gradually framed by a solid and professional organizational structure. On the other hand, an important qualification of this chain, which is a result of these first empirical observations, is that the organization itself is also transformed and becomes more rational. The stages or phases in the chain that we described do not seem to 'hook up' in reality, but rather 'slide' into each other in an almost organic sequence. This observation means that from here on, we will no longer speak of a civil chain but of a *civil sequence*. The various stages remain recognizable, nevertheless. For instance, in the case of Les Têtes de l'Art we can discern clearly defined periods of rationalization during which not only initial intuition and intuitive acts are taking shape in an articulated view, but the organization itself also becomes more rational. In addition, from the interview with Khebizi we can deduce that this process of rationalization is not only initiated in part but most certainly also enhanced by that other element in the civil sequence, communication. The head of Les Têtes de l'Art specifically stated that the municipal authorities of Marseille approached him in 2003. They were interested in his activities and even had ideas for specific 'assignments' for Les Têtes. At the time, however, Khebizi felt slightly 'embarrassed' as he could not precisely explain to them what the organization was actually doing. After all, neither vision nor methods had been written down or rationalized yet. It was this very invitation to communicate that more or less forced the artistic leader to further specify certain self-rationalizations – such as "bringing

art closer to social reality" – and make them more explicit. In that sense, communication enhances the rationalization process.

Although all these endeavours support better communication with governments and potential partners and also make both the approach and the methods of the organization itself more effective, it is not these rationalization processes that sustain the drive within the organization. The initial emotion as well as the personal drive remains relatively vague, even after this process of rationalization. And perhaps making explicit these words, concepts and methods is not what catches on with people (both within and outside Les Têtes de l'Art) and keeps the drive and energy in the organization. But then, what does?

Answering the question as to how they keep the fire burning, Khebizi talks about wanting to work *with* people and thus bridge the gap between art and society. It is precisely this simple act of making art together with others or 'doing things' that plays an important part. Drive is not so much communicated in words, and energy rarely comes from a well-articulated view. Rather, they emerge from the activities that are organized, the artistic interventions that are staged and the actions that are undertaken. Just like the transference of emotions can take place subconsciously and non-verbally through mirror neurons, drive and energy are primarily communicated through the actions themselves. It is therefore not surprising that at some point in the interview Khebizi speaks of 'mirroring' when he mentions other actors and organizations that imitate or partly take over the methods of Les Têtes. Seeing others act makes us act as well, actions generate actions and energy generates energy. In this we also see the power of culture-specific artistic interventions. They generate a 'mimetic effect', which spurs others into action. Artistic interventions and performances in public space, or an educational project with children often indirectly and in an especially positive manner point out the social issues within a group, neighbourhood or square. Cultural civil actions not only bring to light what is not visible, but also make manifest how the surroundings, a space or a neighbourhood may be experienced differently.

In this respect, artistic activities differ from other civil actions such as protests, opinion pieces, or petitions. Whereas such civil actions are generally limited to social criticism, the artistic civil action has an extra element: an alternative experience. For a little while the artists provide an often quite modest, but possibly different world, which in most cases generates positive energy. Les Têtes

de l'Art illustrated this quite literally with their initiatives named Place à l'Art, a sort of 'fair' where people in the neighbourhood can engage together in all sorts of creative and artistic activities, producing very positive social dynamics in places where previously drug dealers and other petty criminals created an unsafe social environment. The outrage over an unsafe environment is immediately 'compensated' for with a positive alternative. Or, referring again to the transformations in our civil sequence: at the emotional level, especially artistic interventions provide opportunities for converting negative feelings or irritations into a positive experience and energy. Conversely, for some it might be precisely this alternative experience that makes them understand that their living conditions or precarious social environment are far from ideal. Crucial in this is that it is 'through' the artistic process or the work of art itself that participants are given an experience of alternative possibilities. Our other field researcher Maité Juan provides the following example of Bel Horizon (a degraded building in the centre of Marseille). After the request of an inhabitant of the high-rise flat, the participatory television of Les Têtes de l'Art organized a collective work of several months in 2013-2014. A group of adults and children from the tower block worked together on a script and collectively produced a fictional video about a problematic situation that affected all inhabitants. The fiction involved children and adults of the tower block as actors. It told the funny story of an investigation carried out by the inhabitants to find out who threw waste out of the windows of the building. The artistic vector allowed for alternative representations to the negative image attached to the place and encouraged the meeting of inhabitants in the tower. After this fiction, a second project, in 2015, consisted in realizing five short films about the wishes of inhabitants about the rehabilitation of the tower.

The Bel Horizon case is just one of many actions by Les Têtes de l'Art that demonstrate how an artistic experience works within civil action. As noted earlier, (negative) criticism of a certain situation goes hand in hand with theatrical action that generates a rather positive experience of an alternative situation. This positive experience in turn evokes new criticism and civil action.

Or, as we said: the artistic activity of Les Têtes is what is keeping the energy alive. If such a positive experience does no longer or not yet exist in the social reality, this actually provides a cultural organization with an interesting tool to create this circumstance all the same, especial-

ly in a fictional setting. A play or film creates a distance from the world we actually live in and thereby precisely generates the context for an alternative world. It is this experience that can make participants reflect on their real social reality. For them art generates – in the words of the sociologist Niklas Luhmann (1997) – a 'second order observation': from the artistic, imaginary or fictional 'second order' experience they can better observe how they live and experience their own everyday 'first order' reality. In the cases of Place à l'Art and Bel Horizon we see how this experience then encourages people to intervene in real life or at least long for and demand a different reality.

From our modest observations of Les Têtes de l'Art's activities we also learn something interesting about the difference between civil actions and artistic civil actions. In the first place, artistic processes provide the possibility to transform an initially negative emotion or an irritation into a positive (aesthetic) experience. In the second place, the artistic aspect especially provides a chance to experience something that is lacking in reality within a different context, albeit an imaginary one. This experience of a fictive 'reality' *may* – and indeed this is only a potential – bring people to start questioning the reality they are living every day. Finally, whereas many civil actions (such as protests or petitions) derive their energy but also their legitimacy and efficacy from representativeness, cultural actions do so from their theatrical character or, literally, their 'performance'. A rally or a petition is as convincing as the number of people showing up or signing: the greater the number, the more convincing. In other words, public support in quantitative terms determines the value of the civil action to a high degree. But in cultural civil action there is at least one other element. In those actions the experience itself of, for example, working together in preparing and presenting a performance, production or music recital, co-determines the efficacy of the civil endeavour. Here it is the quality of the experience rather than the quantity in terms of the number of participants that determines the civil potential. What we are trying to say is, with cultural civil action it is precisely this unique sensation – sometimes experienced by a very small group – that charges them with energy and makes it convincing. It is this singular experience that makes the civil engine run and keeps it running.

It is for good reason that the sociologist Luc Boltanski and the economist Laurent Thévenot (1991) have described *representation* or representativeness as a crucial

quality of what they call the 'civic world'. A union leader can only be effective if he is able to convince the members (sometimes by opening the strike fund); a politician only derives his mandate from his electorate; and special interest groups can only look after their interests if indeed there is a *group* behind them. What we have discussed above is that cultural civil action introduces a new element into this classic civil value regime of quantitative representation. The persuasive power of an artistic intervention or cultural manifestation does not depend on the size of the group involved or the wider consensus on a criticism or new idea. It can just as well base itself on precisely the unique, idiosyncratic, even most deviating and 'crazy' sensation. In other words, civil power and power of persuasion are thus based on the quality of a singular experience.

Our initial observations of the civil activities at Les Têtes de l'Art teach us something about the specific role of the arts. As we said, deploying art 1) makes it possible to transform a negative emotion into positive energy, 2) has a mirroring or 'mimetic' effect and keeps the energy alive, 3) offers the chance to look at lived reality in a different way and perhaps criticize it, and 4) increases the possibility of bringing a unique, deviating or uncompromising idea or view of society into the civil arena. How persuasive such an alternative proposition is depends not so much on the number of people who already support it, but rather on the quality or persuasiveness of the experience of the execution of this idea (albeit fictional). We could therefore say that the requirement of representativeness does not fully apply to artistic civil actions. Not having to speak in the name of a group, or the members of a union or political party, does mean that one can address 'non-affiliated' groups or members of society. Cultural civil actions therefore also have the potential to reach out to very diverse segments of the population and professional groups throughout society. How that exactly works will be discussed further in the Zagreb case.

TRANSVERSAL ACTION

The first surprise we got when starting our investigation into our Zagreb case, Culture 2 Commons, was that it did not exist. Or rather, not in the form of a 'traditional' organizational structure: Culture 2 Commons is in fact a provisional hub or cluster, founded tactically in order to make optimum use of several funding programmes (amongst which ECF) and consisting of three previously existing organizations, namely the national Clubture net-

work, Operation City Zagreb and Right to the City Zagreb. It operates within a network configuration that addresses issues or initiates actions, thus channelling temporarily accumulated energy. Or, as Teodor Celakosi, one of the key figures of this scene, describes it in an interview with Dietachmair: "It is like an ecological system and it is not coordinated as by one subject, but as a kind of swarm of intelligent knowledge."

As with Les Têtes de l'Art, we observed some distance between theory and empirical reality in Zagreb. Although the basic emotion from our 'civil sequence' is much easier to point out here than in Marseille, we can however not pinpoint one specific 'irritation' in Culture 2 Commons and the scene around it. What does stand out is one very concrete problem: space for independent culture. A shortage of physical space and accommodation for cultural activities and the lack of visibility of the artistic and cultural expressions that the independent scene represents in the mainstream media, initially formed the core of the civil struggle and generated the basic energy for civil action. The founding of alternative media such as magazines and the occupation of empty factories to give place and face to their alternative culture occur more or less simultaneously. In Zagreb, this tactical fight rapidly expands to domains outside the cultural sector that oppose the privatization of public spaces. Such actions range from protests against the construction of a shopping mall on a formerly public square to resistance against the privatization of the highway network in Croatia.

The activities of Culture 2 Commons thus are spreading out on least two levels: 1) geographically, the civil actions are soon disseminated across the whole of Croatia, for example via the national network of cultural organizations within the independent scene, and 2) at the social level, we see a widening of the artistic and cultural sector into, for example, trade unions and ecological pressure groups. In other words, the cultural scene joins a broader social movement that connects transversally to many different segments of the population and spheres in life. One example of this is *Pravo na Grad* (Right to the City), which was established as a collaboration between civil society organizations working in the field of culture and youth, and was later formalized as an NGO. All activities of Right to the City are implemented in collaboration with *Green Action – Friends of the Earth Croatia*, one of the most relevant Croatian environmental NGOs. This social broadening is crucial in increasing the power and charging the energy of civil actions. In this respect too,

well-known civil activities of traditional representational politics in which, for instance, trade unions and their members play a central part are forsaken in favour of actions that no longer rely on quantity alone but look for the quality of the singular dissonant voice.

This brings us to an important note: the transversal nature of contemporary civil action should be considered as an expression of the broader socio-economic shifts from welfare state to neoliberalism and from Fordism to post-Fordism in the workplace (see also Gielen 2015a), that have the effect that both social problems and struggles are and can no longer be limited to the sphere of labour or, in classic Marxist terms, be reduced to class relationships. Nowadays, working conditions affect all aspects of life – or become 'biopolitical', to use the phrase by Michel Foucault (1997) – with the increasing flexibility of working hours (the line between work and leisure or private time is less and less strictly drawn) and the increased immateriality of work. It seems therefore almost obvious that civil actions that run transversally through various spheres in life fit better within this macro-sociological evolution. Neoliberalism affects the whole of our personalities, and it therefore seems evident that civil actions too are aimed at this totality of the world with its various life spheres (home, ecology, economy, education, politics, et cetera). Any contemporary civil critique or action will therefore be most productive when it engages in this 'total life sphere', i.e. when it becomes 'cultural'.

The independent scene engages in a struggle for its own culture. That is, a struggle in which artists claim space to signify themselves within a society. We have already stressed that this is the very essence of culture: assigning meaning and sense to our own existence within a certain society. Civil action therefore not only joins a political or economic struggle but is also always a cultural undertaking to represent or 'signify' oneself, one's own lifestyle and values within a certain society. Like art, civil action is a way of breaking open and expanding this container of meanings called 'culture'.

To what extent do the rationalization, communication and, finally, organization of the basic emotions in Zagreb, and Croatia as a whole, follow the civil sequence? That we can learn from one of the organizations there, namely Multimedijalni Institut (MI2) and its Net.culture club MaMa. The founders of this organization play a defining role in inspiring, driving and coordinating the whole scene. Since its establishment in 2000, this organization

has been weaving together interests of diverse cultural fields, such as 1) critically inflected digital arts, film, music and open access, 2) digital commons, 3) philosophy and theory, 4) cultural networking, advocacy and grass-roots organizing, and 5) protection of public domain and struggles for spatial justice.

Locally, MI2 is mostly identified with the social and cultural centre MaMa in Zagreb, where it organizes cutting-edge cultural, educational and technology programmes, hosts a local hacker community and provides an open venue for other cultural initiatives. But it is also a co-organizer of a Human Rights Festival, electronic music events, publishing activities and the Croatian distributor of Creative Commons licenses. It is immediately clear how these cultural organizations operate. To put it simply, we could say that in Zagreb and elsewhere in Croatia they are in fact turning an open access on-line system into an off-line model. In any case, new media and digital network culture are among the most important sources of inspiration for 'real-life' analogue organization. Not only does the virtual world work as a mirror for developing organizational models in the 'real' world, it also provides inspiration for civil actions such as 'hacking' tactics and communication via open access. For example, MaMa was the direct inspiration for founding the Clubture Network of similar-minded local 'clubs' in 2002. Clubture Network brings together over fifty independent cultural organizations that are active in various contemporary cultural and artistic disciplines all across Croatia. It functions as a collaborative exchange platform through which organizations directly collaborate, based on principles of mutual decision-making and inclusiveness.

FIGURE 2: EXHIBITION ON INDEPENDENT CULTURAL SPACES IN VUKOVAR AT THE OCCASION OF 9TH CLUBTURE FORUM IN VUKOVAR / OCT 2016.

The use of powerful visual as well as theatrical means not only makes their actions more visible in the media, but the inventive and sometimes playful character of their actions also makes them contagious and generates positive energy. Their techniques convert initially negative emotions or irritations into action while simultaneously preventing them from being stigmatized as 'sourpusses' or doom mongers. Applying creative methods demonstrates a remarkable optimism, or at least inventiveness and the readiness to approach social and cultural problems in a different manner. For example, submitting a petition with 54,000 signatures as a pile of paper or digitally, has quite a different effect than when you hang those 54,000 postcards physically in the public space, as the activists of Pravo na Grad did. And a protest against plans of the Ministry of Construction comes across stronger when you actually cordon off the ministry's building with yellow crime scene tape than by writing a traditional opinion piece. The same goes for a theatrical performance in which activists dressed as tourists arrived at Kulmer Castle – with media attention – to claim their hotel rooms. Kulmer Castle is registered as a public hotel but has for many years now been used as a private residence by the Todoric family, one of the richest families in Croatia. The castle is built in a green area, where facilities for private housing are not allowed. Underlining its official public purpose as a tourist location, Right to the City – arriving by tourist coach – demanded access to the non-existent hotel rooms in the building. The original imagination and theatricality of such actions not only pays out in media coverage, but their innovative and playful character also has a contagious effect with other social movements, NGOs and civil action groups.

In other words, we see once again the already mentioned 'mimetic' or 'mirror' effect of forms of artistic expression. In any case, the use of such artistic means and involvement of the media was replicated nationally in very diverse places in Croatia. And although, as in Marseille, Europe is not foremost in everyone's mind in Zagreb, perhaps here we have an important medium for arriving at a more international support base. Like the Guy Fawkes masks seen all over the world, likewise original forms of expression and performances may at least work as 'carriers' in shaping a wider civil playing field. In order to do this, the cultural sector must indeed demonstrate the will "to break down its own walls", as Croatian cultural activists mentioned on the spot. This means in the first place that the cultural sector realizes and acknowledges that its own problems are also the problems of others. The issues of a shrinking public space, "enclosure of the commons", precarious working conditions, but also of a diminishing autonomy or chance of self-regulation, is after all not exclusive to the world of artists and cultural organizations. Today, it is a problem shared by education, health care, the legal system, the press and parliamentary democracy. In short, constituting a pan-European civil domain not only demands an international but also a transversal and a 'trans-sectoral' approach. That is perhaps one of the most important lessons that we can draw from Marseille and Zagreb so far.

CONCLUDING REMARKS: TOWARDS A PAN-EUROPEAN PUBLIC SPHERE?

We have discussed how cultural organizations contribute to the civil domain and to civil action. To a large extent, our case studies followed the logic of the 'civil chain' we laid out in section 3, although the cases also led us to adapt or specify the model in some aspects. The cultural organizations we studied channel and translate emotions, resulting in interventions and activities in public spaces. The most important lessons from our cases were, in the first place, that the added value of culture in these organizations exists in the 'mirroring' effect of their actions, which communicate the 'spark' that once inspired their initiative. In other words: the emotion that we situated at the beginning of the 'civil chain' is also its result, intended or otherwise. It was clear that the cases we chose were very much aware of their position and role within civil society, not only at a practical and strategic level but often also at a theoretical level. In the second place, we learned that these cultural organizations are increasingly part of wider social movements. It is remarkable that when asked about the initial 'emotion', 'irritation' or 'frustration' that started the 'civil sequence' for them, both the initiators of Les Têtes de l'Art and of Culture 2 Commons also referred to the obstacles to their artistic practice: for example, an excess of bureaucracy or the lack of a physical space to practise their profession. The comparison with Matryoshka dolls made by one of the interviewees in Zagreb is quite apt: when trying to address a certain issue (for example, the lack of space for cultural activities) you discover other political issues behind it and in order to solve those issues you stumble upon other interests (cultural, political, economic or otherwise), et cetera.

This brings us back, finally, to an issue we already addressed in section 2, namely how a civil domain could function on a transnational (in this case pan-European) level. Could these organizations themselves contribute to a pan-European civil domain? When asked about this possibility the actors involved proved to be sceptical. They often already have their hands full with activating local citizenship, putting local political issues on the agenda and dealing with local authorities, and hardly have time and energy left to worry about such an abstract entity as 'Europe'. Still, in the development of these organizations thus far we already observe, in a relatively short time span, an impressive expansion of their network, at two levels: from internal-artistic to social, and from the lo-

cal to the regional level. We have seen especially in the Zagreb case that an expansion to the rest of the region and collaboration with other regions in the former Yugoslavia are high on the agenda, but Les Têtes de l'Art too strives for a wider network in the Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur. If we extrapolate this trend it is very well possible that their agendas develop in such a way that, sooner or later, a cultural-political network for Europe becomes more concrete. And in fact, both cases we studied are currently part of the ECF-supported Connected Action for the Commons, which tries to extend such initial encounters among local actors towards exploring the possibility for creating a cultural civil agenda on a European scale. Within these kinds of networks culture organizations soon realize they are often dealing with similar problems, albeit in their own (local) context, and therefore can also learn from each other.

Furthermore, the notion of a pan-European civil domain does not need to be as general or abstract as it is often considered to be. Of course, the contexts of the various European cultural organizations and their local civil domains differ, sometimes even radically so, but nonetheless they can find each other on the theoretical and sometimes ideological level, and inspire each other. One example of this was the Connected Action for the Commons workshop that we took part in ourselves during our visit to Marseille. One thing we noticed, was that a discussion about the fact that residents around the 2015 Place à l'Art location and other neighbourhoods could soon not have plants or flowers in front of their houses anymore (because of a pending city ordinance) seamlessly progressed into a discussion about David Harvey's notion of 'commoning the city' (2012) as the claiming or reclaiming of the urban public space. During this discussion, the participants from distant locations such as Warsaw, Zagreb, Chisinau and Barcelona had no trouble at all in understanding each other. In other words, the sometimes indeed perhaps 'abstract' quality of the notion of a European civil domain and of the ideals that we as European citizens might want to see as the foundation of the European Union, can certainly contribute to articulating protest and to channelling and directing political emotions.

REFERENCES

BOLTANSKI, Luc & THÉVENOT, Laurent
1991 *On Justification. Economies of Worth.*
Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.

CASTELLS, Manuel
2015 *Networks of Outrage and Hope.*
Social Movements in the Internet Age.
Second Edition, Enlarged and Updated.
Cambridge: Polity Press.

COHEN, Jean & ARATO, Andrew
1992 *Civil Society and Political Theory.*
Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

DE BRUYNE, Paul & GIELEN, Pascal (eds)
2011 *Community Art. The Politics of Trespassing.*
Amsterdam: Valiz.

DE CAUTER, Lieven et alii (eds)
2010 *Art and Activism in the Age of Globalization.*
Rotterdam: NAi Publishers.

FOUCAULT, Michel
1997 *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth.*
New York: The New Press.

FRASER, Nancy et alii
2014 *Transnationalizing the Public Sphere.*
Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.

GIELEN, Pascal
2015a *The Murmuring of the Artistic Multitude.*
Global Art, Politics and Post-Fordism. Third
Enlarged and Completely Revised Edition.
Amsterdam: Valiz.

2015b A Caravan of Freedom: Mobile Autonomy
beyond 'Auto-Mobility'. In *Mobile Autonomy.*
Exercises in Artistic Self-Organization. Nico
Dockx & Pascal Gielen (eds). Amsterdam:
Valiz. Pp. 63-83.

GIELEN, Pascal & LIJSTER, Thijs
2015   Culture: The Substructure of a European
        Common. In *No Culture, No Europe.*
        On the Foundations of Politics.
        Pascal Gielen (ed). Amsterdam: Valiz. Pp. 19-64.

HABERMAS, Jürgen
1989   *The Structural Transformation of the Public*
        Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois
        Society. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

HALL, Stuart
1986   The Problem of Ideology. Marxism Without
        Guarantees. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*,
        vol. 10, no. 2: 28-44.

HARVEY, David
2012   *Rebel Cities. From the Right to the City to the*
        Urban Revolution. London: Verso.

KOOPMANS, Ruud & STATHAM, Paul (eds)
2010   *The Making of a European Public Sphere. Media*
        Discourse and Political Contention. Cambridge:
        Cambridge University Press.

LUHMANN, Niklas
1997   *Die Kunst der Gesellschaft.* Frankfurt am Main:
        Suhrkamp.

RANCIÈRE, Jacques
2015   *Dissensus. On Politics and Aesthetics.* Translated
        by Steven Corcoran. London, New Delhi and
        New York: Bloomsbury.

WALZER, Michael (ed)
1995   *Toward a Global Civil Society.*
        Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books.

WILLIAMS, Raymond
1995   *The Sociology of Culture.* New Edition.
        Chicago: University of Chicago Press.