

Spaces Without Time

Jasna Koteska, Macedonia

I open this article with two of my relatively recent experiences with the public spaces, invoking here Hanna Arent's notable saying, that the public space is in fact deeply private.¹

Lenin's Cheek

In the summer of 2009 I was at the National Art Gallery in Sofia, Bulgaria, where an exhibition called "The Faces from Underground" curated by Bisera Iosifova was taking place. The exhibition was a collection of monuments, sculptures and paintings from the Bulgarian communist past, with faces of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Todor Zivkov and other communist leaders. After the exhibition, my five years old son, while running at the back yard of the gallery, suddenly stopped in the grass, and leaned down towards something that was looking like a big sculpture of Lenin, that was entirely lying in the grass outside the gallery. And, first I saw my son giving a handshake to what was apparently a Lenin's bronze hand, and then, to much of my surprise, he approached Lenin's face even closer, and he gave him a kiss in his cheek. Since I was very interested in the phenomena of communist past, having in mind my family's history (my father, the Macedonian poet Jovan Koteski, was observed by the secret communist police of Josip Broz Tito's Yugoslavia for 42 years out of his 69 years old life, from 1948 to 1990; his secret police file was maintained under the code name "The Intimist"; my father severely suffered from paranoia all his life, and eventually he served two years in Skopje's prison, from 1985 to 1987), I was indeed shaken by this empathy towards the dead Lenin demonstrated by my five years old son.

Of course, the reason behind my son's gesture, was this obvious humiliation of Lenin. For my son he was not a historical Lenin, but a Lenin in shame. And I remembered someone's remark that the shame is the only intimacy untouched even by ourselves. And

even though, the gallery's backyard served as a sort of post-ideological wasteland, presupposingly neutral, where an abandoned ideology was being put in decomposition, to rotten, this public space was far from being neutral. As Freud says in his "Civilization and its Discontents" (1930) while talking about the city of Rome, you cannot fill the same space twice, with both the present and the past;² all you can have is a mixture of both, but that mixture is never actually neutral. And of course, we should be aware that the technical reasons behind Lenin's humiliation were that either he was too big to be placed inside the hall, or it was an artistic comment on the past (and if nothing, with his victim's conto, Lenin does deserve to be humiliated). But, the whole problem is much bigger, ever since the fall of Iron Curtain, the question was: what to do with the communist propaganda monuments all over Eastern Europe? And in some cases, the monuments were destroyed (or excavated, reburied, kidnapped, attacked, etc), or in other cases, Memento Parks were introduced, mostly outside of the cities (as a suburban collective bags of memory, but also as a pact of solidarity between the abandoned ideology and the spatial margins), where you could visit the area, take a stroll down the memory lines, etc.

McDonald's Asylum

I will go to my second experience from the summer of 2008, now. We were visiting Singapore, and to my view it was a kind of a Disneyland for adults, but with a death penalty (because of the Singaporean death penalty law which prohibits possessing of marihuana or other drugs for that matter). Nevertheless, the city is organized as a Lego land; it resembles an open shopping mall, with a lot of units for food, shopping, fun, leisure; everything is regulated, highly organized, people from sitcoms live there, all are elegant, etc. And then, from Singapore we took a bus to Malaysia, and the first Malaysian city after the gates is Johor Bahru. When we entered the city, I felt a cultural shock: everything was messy, chaotic, dirty, no regulation, no signs, people were dragging you around, the ground could open and eat you alive and nobody will notice, this is how I felt. Which is vulgar to the highest point, having in mind that I am coming from the culture with the very same behavior and lifestyle (only in my case, it is not an Asian culture, but more of an oriental and Balkan one, five centuries under the Ottoman Empire, communist

heritage, postcommunist transitional chaos, etc), so it was indeed a severe case of a reverse cultural shock. Nevertheless, I felt endangered. And then, I saw a McDonald's sign, I entered the restaurant and I didn't want to move from it for the next two hours. In short, McDonald's served my purpose of a shelter.

Now, there are many writings about the role of Mc Donald's in today's world, and my personal favorite is Rolf Potts's text: "Slumming the Golden Archives",³ in which Potts says that if you are a traveler you don't go to Mc Donald's for food anymore; if you are a traveler you go there for an air conditioning, for clean restrooms, but most importantly, you go there to put on pause your overexcitement with your new surroundings. And Potts goes on to claim that McDonald's is no longer a holder of American culture, it became more of a place of absence of place and culture really (in Potts' words: "A Zen-like oblivion experience"), that came to function as a refuge for travelers. With which even Potts don't agree himself, he says that of course it is stupid to patronize McDonald's today, it is as if you confess that you wet your bed, because McDonald's is a globally standardized symbol of protest with reason – it stands behind the cultural degradation of the world, it is a symbol of corporate cruelty, etc., but at the same time, it is a postmodern asylum for tourists, or at least I've experienced it that way.

So, my paper stands on the ground of these two experiences. Although they are totally different, what I find similar in both cases, is that space is there, it is manipulated, ideologized, not neutral, but the *manner*, the *operation* through which the ideologies are ruling the space, is precisely via the notion of time - its mixture, or confusion, or distortion (in the first case), or the time is ignored, or more or less implicitly absent (in the second case). So, what we are missing in our discussions on the public spaces all the time, is the time itself. And by time, I mean the historical time, but also the cultural and the ideological time, and even the physical time itself – in Mc Donald's just like in shopping malls, the notion of time and even of climate is being suppressed, there is no winter and summer, no day and night, nor snow or sun; it is not that the climate is being destroyed in the shopping mall, more importantly, the climate is been suppressed.⁴

Disappearance of Time

Now, to claim that time and space are to be treated independently is a strange idea, because ever since the beginnings of the Western philosophy, we are used to treat the time and space as inseparable; we say that the time is fixed with the space; that the history of time is not to be separated from the history of space, etc. But, in Lefebvre's famous book "The Production of Space" (1974), one is to find a different and apparently disturbing position. After affirming that the space is primordial (which is also a Nietzschean concept of space as primal), Lefebvre annoyingly concludes that the time is vanishing from the space, and that this bizarre disappearance of time from space is connected to the modern sociopolitical conditions, or in Lefebvre's words: 'This manifest expulsion of time is arguably one of the hallmarks of modernity.'⁵ And more so:

In nature, time is apprehended within space – in the very heart of space... Time was thus inscribed in space, and natural space was merely the lyrical and tragic script of natural time... With the advent of modernity time has vanished from social space... Economic space subordinates time to itself; political space expels it as threatening and dangerous (to power). The primacy of the economic and above all of the political implies the supremacy of space over time. It is thus possible that the error concerning space that we have been discussing actually concerns time more directly, more immediately, than it does space, time being even closer to us, and more fundamental. Our time, then, this most essential part of lived experience, this greatest good of all goods, is no longer visible to us, no longer intelligible.⁶

However true, Lefebvre's argument about the disappearance of time from spaces (maybe partly due to the unclear concept of divine, spiritualist nature, which one can read in these lines), to some extent seems, fails to pull the whole problem of absent time to its roots, i.e. this time-space gap might appear to be a problem much bigger than just modernity (even an ontological one?), but what one must agree with Lefebvre here, is that the 20th

century have been indeed more severe towards the notion of time, than any other previous era.

Two of the greatest ideologies of the 20th century, capitalism and communism (even fascism with its famous call: “We need a breathing room”, which was referring directly to the notion of space) - they all introduced space with some radical abyss of history assembled in it. So space has been manipulated, but this manipulation was possible only on conditions of operating with the time itself. Time is crucial to our feeling of normality, the way through which people avoid madness, guarantee of our sanity, and whoever regulates time, actually directly regulates us. (This is most evident in the elementary practices of prisoner’s tortures, the best way to drag whatever confession you want from the person you torture, is to intervene in his/her regularity of time, by introducing irregular sleeping hours: once during the day, next time during nights, different longitudes of sleeping hours allowed, etc.)

The space is easy to recognize when it is being manipulated, because it is mostly perceived by gaze, and neatly connected to our experiences of the body: city square as a brain, an old Bazaar as a stomach, etc. But, the time is not so easy to grasp; there are at least three notions of time. 1. There is a physical time (the seasons, agricultural circles, etc.); 2. An ideological time, time ruled by ideologies (erase previous holidays and introduce others, and already you rule people, and actually in all postcommunist countries the right governments did precisely this when they came to power, in Macedonia, but also in Poland, Russia, Hungary, etc., they were immediately pulling off the previous holidays and introducing others. Which is an old method, know ever since the beginnings of the communism itself, communists said that the time before the Revolution is canceled, and it should be restarted from the zero point); 3. And of course, there is a third notion of time - time is a capital problem of metaphysics, and if the problem of time is to be solved, then everything else will be solved. But, luckily, the problem does not seem to have an answer, therefore we can remain restless, as Borges playfully concludes in his essay on time.⁷

Marx or Mars?

What was exactly the manner through which communism and capitalism have been ideologizing the space (from which time has been irretrievably lost), and why?

The public space was a trade mark of communism. The space was an open space, indeed a public space; communists were obsessed with open parks, city squares, stadiums, rituals and parades, the theatricality of manifestations. The communist Revolution was proclaimed a work of art with the public space (Mayakovsky spoke of making 'the streets... our brushes and the squares our palettes.'⁸); the totalitarian leaders acted towards life as towards a big scene, leaders were like directors of space (Stalin wanted to make a 'total artwork out of society'⁹), etc. The best abstract painter at the beginnings of the Soviet Union, Kazimir Malevich in 1919, one year after he exhibited his 'White Square on White Background' in 1918 (a painting where there was literary nothing!), and two years after the October Revolution, he left his testament to the communist artists: 'After me comrade aviators sail into the chasm - I have set up the semaphores of Supermatism... Infinity is before you.'¹⁰

And these triumphant outbursts were in fact neatly connected to the communist dream of a spatial conquer. It is not by chance that the detached ideological apparatus of communism recognized its favourite genre in - science fiction! The relation between science fiction and communism is well documented. The Soviets translated Jules Verne and Herbert G. Wells; some writers were describing the ideal Marxist society on Mars, etc. There is a well known Yugoslav pun, where after one Marxism lecture, a student, confusing Marx with Mars, asked: "But, tell me, is there life on that Mars anyway?"¹¹ Three years after the October Revolution, in 1920, Herbert G. Wells, the author of 'Time Machine', traveled to Russia to meet the leaders of the Revolution. In Kremlin he interviewed Lenin, and Lenin told him: 'If we succeed in making contact with the other planets, all our philosophical, social, and moral ideas will have to be revised, and in this event these potentialities will become limitless and will put an end to violence as a necessary means of progress'.¹² Communism was an ideology of philosophical appeal,

not only because it promised people "the oceanic feeling for all", but also it promised them the space as a final frontier.

So, while the idea of a public space has been extended to maximum, what was an enemy in communism was a private space; communism was in a war with houses and homes. There is a book 'How to live differently' (Kostrom, 1925) from one of the leading Soviet thinkers, Shchekin, in which, based on Trotsky's ideas, Shchekin writes: 'I should immediately say that the notion room shall mean only the former human's formerly inhabited space.'¹³ So, after the October revolution, he instantly sketches out the space, and says: there are not going to be any rooms anymore, rooms shall be physically destroyed, if one it to survive, it shall survive solely as a museum value, the reason being that the room is a den, it is unclear what dark moments may grasp the communist in the solitude of the room. But this is not a new idea, already Thomas More in his 'Utopia' (1516), while explaining the ideal state, was describing the rooms and doors of the citizens. ('The doors are two-winged, they open and close on the slightest touch and then, by closing themselves, they let everyone in.' – More says). And while reading More, one soon realises that the houses and the clothing are not just socialist décor, they are the most intrinsic feature of the ideal society; transform the door into a pass into the world and what you get is the ideal society. (Or: 'I shall not greet the uninvited guests, I never asked them to come' – here is a memory from Lukacs's childhood. Childhood is constantly under threat, in a crisis, just about anything can harm the little person, and Lukacs – the child, before becoming Lukacs – the ideologist, says: I didn't invite you, you have imposed yourselves on me, but this was however before the euphoria of communal life caught up with him.)

Soviet Potatoes and Macedonian Goats

But what I claim here is that all these projects were not pure experiments with space, they were directed towards the time. In which way? The communism was an era in search for a New Form in everything, from Malevich squares in art, to reshaping the public space.

One example is to be found in the 1920's, when the Soviet architect, Vladimir Tatlyn, was removing the blocks from the pavement in front of the Academy of Art in Leningrad and was planting potatoes in the bared ground! But although this looks as a communist attempt to redefine the bourgeois relationship towards nature (Marx in 1844 wrote that in order to abolish alienation, people need to make peace with nature), paradoxically, this call was not read as an ecological cry. What was then this bizarre activity all about? It was not that Tatlyn wanted to introduce an absolute space - the nature itself, as a gesture of antiurbanism, quite the opposite, it was a very simple gesture of juggling with the very idea of a form, i.e., communism does not recognise a 'positively' privileged matter, therefore all that intrudes with the New Form, shall be cleared, as Žižek is elaborating in his book 'The Universal Exception'.¹⁴ To prove this hypothesis, there is an opposite examples, one being from my native country

. In September 1947, a hard-line communist Lazar Koliševski, adopted a law called "Regulation for Prohibiting the Farming of Goats", popularly called Lazar's Law, which caused a decrease of the number of goats in Macedonia from 1947 to 1952 for 86.6% - this is a well documented case in Macedonia. And to present day it is an enigma why the communists in Macedonia almost killed one animal species, because it was obviously a useful animal, domesticated for centuries, its farming was economical, it was used for milk, and generally this unutterable slaughter simply seems to not have an explanation.

But, the explanation lies precisely in the basic premise of communism, that whatever was there in the space, should be erased, and new form shall be introduced. The goats were accidental and stupid choice, but not less stupid then Tatlyn's idea of planting potatoes in front of the Academy, instead of an Academy.

If there once was nature - goats, let be culture now (Macedonian case), if there was an Academy, let's plant potatoes instead (Soviet case), etc., and although they are different transfers, from culture to nature and vice versa, the basic premise is that there is no simple difference between nature-culture, there is no privileged substance, culture too is part of a nature. So although both operations amount to a process of reducing the 'truly'

existing nature (or culture) to a *raw material* for construction of the new world, what the ideology was doing was precisely - working with the public space - in order to intervene in the time itself! In other words, erase all previous objects from the space, will mean erase the time itself.

There Are Three Tenses, and All Three are Future Ones

How were communists erasing the time? There is a joke from communist Romania. The question was: 'What is celebrated on 8th May 1821?' And the answer is: 'One hundred years *to* the founding of the Communist Party of Romania.' Communism announced the end of all bourgeois phenomena, but the most important one was the time phenomenon. Time, as it was tracked by capitalists, was deleted and time was restarted. That is why time before the Revolution is just time *TO* the Revolution. There is no history. Mircea Eliade called this socialist tracking of time the most glorious of all modern political eschatologies. Communism introduced new time points, by changing calendars, regulating curfews, working hours; all religious holidays were banned and replaced by profane one, etc. In communism this 'zero time' phenomenon was established through the announcement 'We are waiting for communism. That call was messianic, and it send people a message that they are not living, but that they are in some kind of pre-dress rehearsal, in some *pre-life*.

The favourite saying of the Yugoslav generations was a sentence by Grunf, from the Italian comic book 'Alan Ford': 'It's better to live a 100 years as a millionaire than seven days in poverty'. And this comic book was never as popular, even in the country of origin, as it was in Yugoslavia, because it was a cynical response to the empty floscules about time in communism. Tito's most famous call: 'Live as if there will be 100 years of future peace, but prepare like there will be a war tomorrow' was exactly a parole that was simulated a serious disband with the world, while there was actually no conflict within it. If there is war tomorrow, than there is surely peace today. But the problem is that both peace and war from this parole was concerning the future. Time was structured as a

moving image of eternity that has not come yet. Both war and peace are part of the future. The start is indefinitely postponed.

The well known Ancient philosopher Plotin's famous saying was: 'There are three tenses and all three are present tenses'. When I am here and now, when I remember, and when I plan, all three activities are happening now, at this very moment. In communism was all the same, only, all three tenses where the future ones: I plan in the future, but also I live in the future (waiting for communism), and I remember from some point in the future as well. Hence, the most accurate communist definition of time would be this one: There are three tenses, and all three are future ones.

Time Units of Capitalism

In his "The Aesthetics of Disappearance" Paul Virilio asked a question: 'Why were totalitarian regimes negatively inclined towards Einstein's time theory?' And answered 'Because for them, time was not assigned, it was locally created.'¹⁵ But the problem with this explanation is that it covers all ideologies, not just the totalitarian ones. Anthropologists warn that *all* time is locally created. 'Time per se' does not exist.

In capitalism, time is also created, ideologized. There is a beautiful movie 'About a Boy' (2002) by Chris and Paul Weitz, it is a story about one rich guy who lives in London, and he doesn't have to work, because he inherited a lot of money. So, he spends his days, doing nothing, but it turns out to be a very busy project, and in order not to feel any effort, or boredom, he decides to organize his time in a 'capitalist' fashion. His day is divided in 'time units' – and each such unit is 30 minutes, and for example, showering is one unit, surfing porn on the internet is two units, lunch – three units, hairdresser – four units and so on. And the paradox is that he ends up being employed at the most difficult workplace in the world. He *has to* enjoy himself, and he has to enjoy himself in an organised, capitalist fashion – leisure in capitalism is restructured in precise time units, just as work is. Capitalist time is also 'dictated', 'created' time. Capitalism started precisely when the early capitalism organizing time as linear sequences of time units. It

imposed a certain rhythm on the body so that it can exploit it. It turned agricultural cycles into a linear sequence of same value units. In capitalism, time is linear, but that is not only for work, but for pleasure too.

Capitalism organised the body as a military-political machine, in order to draw out a greater profit from it. Electroshocks were discovered by the Italian psychiatrist Ugo Cerletti in 1938, in the time when fascism was blossoming, and they became the standard method used by the secret police, Virilio writes.¹⁶ If you accelerate the body to a point of madness, from then the exhausted body you can take everything away, it is a perfect body to be ruled over, it will never protest, it will never object, in other words, you have an ideal object for interrogation, monitoring, and exploitation, and this is a commonplace in capitalism. The acceleration of time in capitalism, the philosophy that 'only stopping equals death', etc., the fascination with planes and automobiles, with the city beat, was a part of the capitalist understanding of time. The connecting of the moment of departure with the one of arrival in late capitalism, finally lead to a certain contraction of space-time in concentration points, as virtual, 'non-existent' points. E-mails that started off in the 1990's as some 'pleasure buttons', loving, seducing and playful 'touches' of friends and potential lovers, ended up today as mobile offices (exchange of work plans via this e-mail address, a project via another one, etc.), virtual communication became duller than the dulllest office meetings in the real world. In the virtuality of the late capitalism, space is organized as a non-space, also time as no-time, which ended up in the virtuality of the capitalist 'world without a world' (Badiou).

When in 1959 the USA and the SSSR organised cultural exchange in Moscow, the Soviets brought paintings, art, etc., while the Americans instead of art objects, brought a simple, very prosaic model of a modern kitchen, and Nixon and Khrushchev are being photographed in front of the kitchen, in what Suzan Buck-Morss called a 'Kitchen Conference'.¹⁷ So while communists hated rooms, capitalism did precisely the opposite; the capitalist response was - here is this kitchen, so how would you feel in it? Having a family house and a family car was the essential bourgeois dream; capitalism equipped the house as a small factory, with washing machines, vacuum cleaners (there is a line from a

movie, where a woman says ‘I don’t need a right to vote, what I need is a washing machine’), but the paradox is that not only capitalism turned the home into a *sector of capitalist production*, but in late capitalism into a *sector of porn production*, as well, the obsession with reality family shows, among others. The capitalist logic was: do not open a war with houses and homes (naïve communist approach), but preserve rooms, we will turn them into a television studio, and you will even like it. Žižek writes about the television set that is always on, although I am not watching it, the idea is that the television set is watching me. And he is right when he says that one fear greater than the fear of someone watching me, is that I am not watched at all!¹⁸ If someone does not put me under a looking glass, I shall personally place a camera and broadcast myself on the Internet 24/7. Someone is *bound* to see me.

Post-Time and Pre-Time

And isn’t it that, this combination of cooking and leisure (domestic fantasy of ‘real’ home), but with an extra excitement of being observed all the time, was in the very roots of blossoming of the shopping malls today? Similar to my experience of Mc Donald’s (I was not in it for eating), we are not in shopping malls for shopping, or at least not primarily. The success of shopping malls lays precisely in their promised fantasm of ‘home outside home’, displaced space which not only simultaneously materializes two functions at the same time (I am not alone, there is a ‘familiar’ crowd, but that crowd doesn’t bear the claustrophobic threat of nuclear family relations, the real encounter with others in their unbearable corporeal presence is reduced to minimal, etc.), but by simultaneously serving both functions, the space for the third, most fundamental one, is opened – that of a spectator, who simultaneously offers him/herself to other gazes, and at the same time gazes back at them. Even more, Renata Salecl writes that shopping malls are not pure public spaces, they are mixture of public and private, they resemble public, but you cannot engage in the outdoor activities in them, you cannot protest, hold demonstrations, distribute leaflets, sign petitions and all the other things you can do in the public space, because they are privately owned.¹⁹

One is thus inclined to conclude that the capitalist obsession with these inter-zones of public/private, eventually lead to explosion of cooking shows, reality TV, porn industry, etc. (how others are doing it?), but is also a reason behind the popularity of the sitcom as a genre in late capitalism. All of them, from Gray's Anatomy, to Scrubs, the Office, etc. play on the same logic of closed space, being situated in the limited scope of the workplace, (as Frederic Jameson rightly concludes, workplace is neither public nor private)²⁰ - also elevators, hotel rooms, bathrooms (remember the famous elevator in Gray's Anatomy, or already in Hitchcock's 'North by Northwest' a lot of the personal drama happens in the elevators). And we should bear in mind, that while we are aware that some shopping malls are already dying, what we are not fully aware is that soon they will be treated as ruined cultural heritage; a website called Deadmalls.com already lists some 300 dead or dying shopping malls.

That means that shopping malls as objects that most efficiently succeeded in producing the timeless space, space with suppressed, or implicitly absent time (the paradox being that the more these spaces are being timeless, the more measurements and numberings are being introduced in them, more of Lefebvre's 'terror of clocks'), nevertheless, will soon be presented as pieces of cultural history, very similar to decaying historical spots - in other words, in some distant future, they will be a hallmark of our late capitalist timeless temples. Or, in Badiou's words: 'Capitalism is the first world civilization without world', it has infrastructure, it has space, but the time is a cancelled time. However, the same operation was also valid for communism - communism also had an infrastructure, but instead of the accelerated, virtual and canceled time of capitalism, it had *postponed* time of communism ('we are waiting for communism' parole). In the long history of the 20th century, thus, we came to live all the time, in some sort of a transfer, a passage from *time to post-time* (in capitalism), or from *time to pre-time* (in communism). The 20th century was a long history of the abyss of time, between communist *pre-time* and capitalist *post-time*, what we never actually managed to do is to live *in-time*.

¹ To be precise, Arendt's actual quotation is: 'the public life today is in fact private', as quoted in: Frederic Jameson, *Spatial Systems in North by Northwest in: Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Lacan: But Were Afraid to Ask Hitchcock*, edited by Slavoj Žižek, Verso, London, 1993, p. 52. My incorrect usage of Arendt here, in which life is to be equalized with space, is deliberate. It does not come from the perverse assumption that life should be barely seen as a geometric phenomenon that resides in space, but quite the opposite, as an evidence of the supremacy of space over time, that according to Lefebvre, is deeply rooted in modernity. And precisely on the account of this assumption, space has come to serve as one of few consistent (though fantasmatic) positive supports of our very beings, while with the same operation, time has been expelled as a 'guarantee' of the same being.

² Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents*, The Standard Edition, With a Biographical Introduction by Peter Gay, W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. New York, 17-19.

³ Rolf Potts, 'Slumming the Golden Archives' in: *The Art of Independent Travel* (weekly column on Yahoo News), 5 June 2006. http://news.yahoo.com/s/rolf_potts/20060605/rolf_potts/rolf_potts5166

⁴ See also Renata Salecl, *(Per)versions of Love and Hate*, Verso, London, New York, 1998, 94-96.

⁵ Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith, 1991, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, p. 96.

⁶ *Ibid*, 95.

⁷ H. L. Borges, *Borges Oral*, Emecé Editores, S.A. – Editorial Belgrano, Buenos Aires, 1979. Here I used Serbian translation of the book: H. L. Borhes, Usmeni Borhes, Izdavačko preduzeće Rad, Beograd, 1990, p. 63.

⁸ Quoted in: Susan Buck-Morss, *Dreamworld and Catastrophe*, The MIT Press, 2002, p. 55.

⁹ Susan Buck-Morss, *Dreamworld and Catastrophe*, The MIT Press, 2002, p. 66.

¹⁰ Buck-Morss, Susan (2005): *Dreamworld and Catastrophe*, Belgrade circle, Belgrade, p. 66.

¹¹ Igor Mandić, *Policajci duha*, Globus, Zagreb, 1979, p. 82.

¹² Quoted in: Susan Buck-Morss, *Dreamworld and Catastrophe*, The MIT Press, 2002, p. 44.

¹³ Quoted in: Igor Shafarevich: *The Socialist Phenomenon* (1980), translated by William Tjasma, foreword by Aleksandar I. Solzhenitsyn, Harper & Row, New York. Here I quote from the Serbian translation from 1997, p. 275.

¹⁴ Slavoj Žižek, *The Universal Exception*, Continuum, London, 2006, p. 268.

¹⁵ Paul Virilio, *The Aesthetics of Disappearance*, MIT Press, 1991, Quoted here from the Macedonian translation from 2006, Magor, Skopje, p. 124.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, 51.

¹⁷ Susan Buck-Morss, *Dreamworld and Catastrophe*, The MIT Press, 2002, p. 202.

¹⁸ Slavoj Žižek, *The Spectator's Malevolent Neutrality*, public lecture on the 8th June 2004, Theaterformen Festival, Brunswick, Germany. See: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YAS5P6RZw2A&feature=related>

¹⁹ Renata Salecl, *(Per)versions of Love and Hate*, Verso, London, New York, 1998, 94-95.

²⁰ Frederic Jameson, *Spatial Systems in North by Northwest in: Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Lacan: But Were Afraid to Ask Hitchcock*, edited by Slavoj Žižek, Verso, London, 1993, 69-72.