Where Do They Stand? Deviant Art Institutions and the Liberal Democratic State

EMMA MAHONY

Abstract: *This paper takes the public seminar,* What Do You Stand For: Who's Afraid of Solidarity*?, held at the National College of Art and Design, Dublin in 2012, as a case study for an analysis of the relationship between visual art institutions and left-wing political ideologies. It seeks to contextualise the oppositional practices of its four panellists: Valerie Connor (representing Blue Funk), Mark Garry, Garrett Phelan, and Sarah Pierce, in relation to how they align their practices with the liberal democratic state and the art institutions it funds. The relationship of the state to the politics of resistance that operates against it is the starting point for this analysis. This framework is then mapped onto the art institutional landscape and onto the activities of the panellists. The question then becomes: where do these deviant institutions stand in relation to the state-funded established art institution?*

Keywords: art institution; politics of resistance; new institutionalism; art collective; interstitial

The first task of the deviant art institution is to show the establishment how things can be done differently, to reintroduce the emancipatory potential of art into the establishment.

Introduction

This text will seek to frame the practices of four self-organised artist-initiatives as deviant art institutions, by examining how they align their practices with the liberal democratic state. It takes as its starting point the public seminar *What Do You Stand For: Who's Afraid of Solidarity?*[1] which took place at the National College of Art and Design (NCAD) on 31 March 2012. The seminar brought together a range of self-organised practices that operate alongside, but at a distance to established institutional structures.

The artists' collective, Blue Funk (represented by Valerie Connor), was set up in 1989 by a group of recent graduates from the NCAD (Evelyn Byrne, Valerie Connor, Brian Cross, Tom Green, Brian Hand, Jaki Irvine and Kevin Kelly). Through the use of time-based and new media art, they sought to interrogate the interface between art and politics. At the time, their goal was quite radical: galleries in Ireland were yet to embrace new media on the scale they do today, and literature, not art, was the main source of culture's engagement with politics. The remaining panellists have individual practices that encompass modes of dissemination other than those offered by institutional structures. Mark Garry's curatorial practice sought to address the lack of exhibition opportunities for emerging artists in Ireland; his solution was to initiate a number of ambitious independent exhibitions in the public realm. Alongside his artistic practice, Garrett Phelan established a radio station called A.A.R.T. Radio, which was for a time funded by the Arts Council/An Chomhairle Ealaíon and Irish Museum of Modern Art (IMMA). Sarah Pierce describes her critically reflexive interdisciplinary practice as the *Metropolitan Complex*. It encompasses talks, events, exhibitions and papers in the form of the regularly published *Metropolitan Papers*.

In the context of this text, the adjective 'deviant' refers to an art institution that resists instrumentalisation by the state. It is an institutional model that seeks to operate at arm's length from the state, or, in some instances, entirely outside of it. Its goal is to open up spaces of opposition against the state and to promote counter hegemonic practices. In line with Chantal Mouffe's theory of agonism, it is an institution that 'foments dissent; that makes visible what

#1

Where Do They Stand?
Deviant Art Institutions and
the Liberal Democratic State

Emma Mahony

the dominant consensus tends to obscure and obliterate' (2005a, p. 162).

The relationship to the state is of particular concern here because it refers to the degree to which these deviant art institutions can exercise their democratic potential. However, it is also important to point out that it is not possible to extricate this relationship with the state from a relationship with capital. As Charles Esche points out 'all [art institutions] are necessarily located within the economic hegemony of capitalism' (2004, p. 2). As the welfare state continues to shrink, the former bourgeois Enlightenment model of the art institution is being gradually replaced by a corporatised one with neoliberal values. Furthermore, the state is often complicit in the corporatisation of the art institution by making funding contingent on the adoption of neoliberal values, as is evidenced by the 2012 Irish state Philanthropy Initiative, which incentives art institutions to seek funding from the private sector.[2]

A second distinction that needs to be drawn is between the "establishment" – the dominant state-funded art institutions – and those self-organised initiatives that utilize their existence outside of the establishment to be oppositional. However, it must also be acknowledged that often the goal of emerging self-organised initiatives, the panellists included, is to break into the establishment. Each of the speakers admitted that when they began their alternative activities, they aspired to "become establishment". Doubtless, this ambition was rooted not only in the continuity and stability the mainstream establishment offers (in place of the precarity of the self-organised initiative), but also in achieving institutional ratification.

As it transpired, their early engagements with the establishment were not plain sailing. When faced with rebukes and blank refusals, they were forced to resort to bolder strategies. Unable to secure an exhibition through the conventional route, Blue Funk persuaded the director of the Douglas Hyde Gallery, John Hutchinson, to let them squeeze a one-off exhibition into the turn-around period between the installation and de-installation of the official exhibition programme. Mark Garry realized his most ambitious curatorial venture by not being entirely truthful with potential host venues. Garrett Phelan resorted to unorthodox strategies when his initial applications for funding A.A.R.T. Radio were turned down: he threatened to dedicate his first episode to the shortcomings of state funding mechanisms. Where breaking into the establishment may have been their original ambition, experience has taught the panellists that "becoming established without being establishment" was, in many instances, a preferable goal.

Where do they stand? The political landscape

Where the seminar under discussion examined *what* these self-organised initiatives stand for, I would like to examine *where* they stand. More specifically, where they stand in relation to the state – inside or outside? Or, is there another way of being in relation to the state that is neither completely inside nor outside?

In order to answer these questions, I propose to briefly interrogate the relationship of the liberal democratic state to the left-wing politics of resistance that operates against it. I will then map this political structure onto the art institutional landscape and, in so doing, I will address the question of where the practices of the panellists stand in relation to the state and the art institutions it funds.

Arguably, the dominant paradigm in left wing political philosophy today supports strategies of exodus, defection or exit. Theorists of exodus, Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri and Paolo Virno posit that our society of control necessitates a complete withdrawal from state power – from the liberal democratic parliamentary arena – in order to establish a counter discourse outside

Where Do They Stand?
Deviant Art Institutions and
the Liberal Democratic State

Emma Mahony

of it. What they are proposing is not a negative, defeatist form of withdrawal or individual exodus à la Bartleby,[3] but a positive, collective turning away from society that should instead be linked with Negri's (2009, p. 8) understanding of constituent power – power that is in a permanent process of constituting. Exodus, then, can be interpreted as simultaneously a flight and a constituent practice.

Hardt, Negri and Virno nominate 'the multitude'[4] as the contemporary political subject of exodus. Hardt and Negri posit that the multitude has come into being as a result of 'Empire'[5] and that it represents Empires' counter-revolutionary force. They understand the multitude, in opposition to the people, as boundless, immeasurable and unrepresentable. Virno (2004, p. 22) inverts Thomas Hobbes' understanding of the people to articulate the nature of the multitude. If the people, as Hobbes argued, have 'one will…to whom one action may be attributed' (cited in Virno, 2004, p. 22), then the multitude is the 'dissensual' many. Moreover, if, as Hobbes contends, the concept of the people is related to the existence of the state, then the multitude is linked to an extra-statal existence.

For Virno (2004, pp. 69-70), 'civil disobedience' and 'exodus' are the two forms of political action for the multitude. By civil disobedience he means radical disobedience. It is not about breaking laws but calling their very validity into question. Turning again to Hobbes, Virno argues that the natural law, which compels the people to obey their sovereign, is only law insofar as the state exists, or insofar as the multitude recognises its existence. He imagines civil disobedience, not as protest, but as a form of mass defection from the state, which will ultimately result in the establishment of a 'non-state-run public sphere'. This thinking is commensurate with the actions of the protagonists of José Saramango's 2006 novel, *Seeing*, in which an electorate in a nameless democracy reveal their dissent for government, not by abstaining from voting, but by leaving their ballot papers blank. Their actions can be interpreted as not just a refusal to elect any of the political parties, but as a refusal of the liberal democratic system in its entirely.

Hardt and Negri (2001, p. 330-4) locate the possibility of toppling Empire in a strategy they call 'counterpower'. For them, counterpower means the combination of three historical revolutionary strategies: resistance, insurrection and constituent power. They caution that to be effective these three elements need to be used in tandem. They locate this counterpower in the very flesh of the multitude, in their body and their intellect combined.

Not all thinkers on the left believe that flight is the only option. In her paper, 'Critique as Counter-Hegemonic Intervention' (2008), Chantal Mouffe contends that the strategy of exodus is inherently problematic, as it stems from a flawed understanding of the political that refuses to acknowledge the ever-present possibility of antagonism. In her view, the very existence of antagonism renders the formation of Hardt and Negri's absolute democracy and Virno's non-state-run public sphere impossible; it 'requires relinquishing the idea of a society beyond division and power, without any need for law or the state and where in fact politics would have disappeared' (Mouffe, 2008, p. 5).

Mouffe (2008, pp. 1-6) sets out an alternative approach, which she describes as 'critique as hegemonic engagement with'. In place of exodus and desertion, she proposes 'disarticulation' and 'rearticulation' as forms of political action. Where, as Virno has stated, exodus does not seek to fill the vacuum of power it would potentially leave if it toppled the ruling power, Mouffe contends that every hegemonic order could potentially be challenged and replaced by another counter-hegemonic order. Therefore, for Mouffe, a truly political intervention cannot merely be oppositional; it must both disarticulate and rearticulate the situation afresh.

Where Do They Stand?
Deviant Art Institutions and
the Liberal Democratic State

Emma Mahony

In place of flight from the state, Mouffe advocates Antonio Gramsci's 'war of position', a struggle against the hegemonic apparatuses of the state that needs to be launched in a multiplicity of sites over a long period of time. In her view, the enemy cannot be conceived as one single adversary, as in the case of Empire or capitalism, but as struggles in the plural, against multiple injustices. She sees these struggles forming chains of equivalence between social movements, political parties and trade unions that will transform non-convergent demands into a collective will that is capable of toppling the hegemon and establishing a new hegemony in its place.

For these four political philosophers the distinction is clear cut, one must either chose to fight state politics from within the state system, or flee from it in order to establish a non-state run system on the outside. There is, however, another manner of being in relation to the state that these theorists don't explore. Post-structuralism has theorised this as an 'interstitial' distance. According to Simon Critchley (2007, pp. 92-114) an interstice is an empty space or non-space between structured or established spaces. In effect, it is a space that does not exist. It needs to be created through political articulation, by working within the state to open a space of opposition against the state.

This concept of creating interstitial positions in relation to the state can be related to both the Jürgen Habermas' (1989) understanding of the liberal bourgeois public sphere as it manifested itself in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and György Konrád's (1984) theory of 'antipolitics'. Both antipolitics and the bourgeois public sphere seek to hold political power to account from *within* the state but at a distance to it. Antipolitics points to the need for conventional parliamentary politics to be regularly subjected to pressure by those people who exist *alongside* power. What Konrád is calling for is a system of checks and balances between political power and civil society. Likewise, the function of the bourgeois public sphere was to exercise critical publicity against public (state) power, from a position which was guaranteed by the bourgeois constitutional state to be autonomous from the state, namely civil society. Unlike Mouffe's counter-hegemonic strategy, neither approach wants to seize state power, but simply to exercise judgment over it.

Critchley is the main contemporary advocate of this concept of interstitial distance. He takes the view that we are stuck with the state, that its withering away (contrary to what Marx and Engels imagined, or what Hardt and Negri believe is achievable through Multitude) is unlikely. Given this reality, Critchley proposes that radical politics should be conceived at an interstitial distance from the state. He clarifies that this distance is still *within* the state: 'It is, we might say, an interstitial distance, an internal distance that has to be opened from the inside' (2007, p. 113). This semi-retreat that Critchley strategizes, is one that aims to better the state. In practice, this means using the state's machinations against it, in order to bring about political change.

In what Critchley (2007, p. 123-4) terms 'meta-anarchism', he locates an ability to imaginatively and creatively undermine the state through non-violent warfare. More specifically, he commends the carnivalesque humour, comic tactics and street theatre employed by contemporary anarchic groups like Ya Basta!, Rebel Clown Army and Billionaires for Bush. He argues that they have created a new and powerful language of civil disobedience.[6] Like Mouffe, Critchley also draws on Gramsci's theory of hegemony. It is his proposition that the left should promote a slow and patient establishment of a counter hegemonic force, with the ultimate goal of creating a universal claim against the hegemonic order. Unlike Mouffe, who locates her understanding of the political within the institutions of the state, for Critchley it exists at a distance from the state.

Where Do They Stand?
Deviant Art Institutions and
the Liberal Democratic State

Emma Mahony

The nature of democracy, as it is currently embodied in our liberal democratic hegemony, is a concern that links all three of these political strategies. Democracy, as they all see it, is an incomplete project. They each, in their own way, aim to formulate a more complete concept of democracy. Given that Hardt and Negri understand the multitude as boundless and unrepresentable, it therefore follows that democracy (which is constructed around a bounded national space) cannot represent them. In its place they propose a radical new type of democracy, an 'absolute democracy'. Virno envisions a type of extra-parliamentary democracy, organized on the principle of leagues and councils, which he terms a 'non-state run public sphere'. Mouffe calls for an alternative to liberal democracy that is rooted in radical pluralism. For her, the ineradicable dimension of antagonism necessitates a reliance on state institutions. She argues that such institutions are central to the process of taming antagonisms and converting them into 'agonism'.[7] Mouffe (2002, p. 95) does not, however, see these institutions as being bounded by the nation state, instead she advocates the existence of a global demos within which citizens can exercise their rights of citizenship. Critchley (2007, pp. 92,116-7), for this part, believes that the interstitial distance from the state he supports embodies the *wahre demokratie* (true democracy) that the young Marx championed. In his critique of Hegel's *Rechtsphilosophie*, Marx explains what he understands by true democracy – it is the democracy of the people against the state. The point, for Critchley, is that true democracy can only be enacted at a distance from the state, by the people, against the state.

Where do they stand? The art institutional landscape

Having briefly considered these three political strategies, I would now like to map this structure onto the art institutional landscape (and onto the activities of the panellists at the NCAD debate). In this hypothesis, the state funded art institution represents the liberal democratic state, and the deviant art institution represents the radical left opposition to the state. The question then becomes: where do these deviant art institutions stand in relation to the state-funded art institutions? Furthermore, should they engage in order to instigate change from within, or withdraw and set something else up on the outside? Or, is existing at an interstitial distance to the establishment a valid alternative?

Mouffe's strategy of engagement – fighting state power from within the system – is comparable to a strategy whereby the deviant art institution seeks to reform itself from within. Of course, in order to reform the establishment, you have to first be a part of it, and this involves passing through official channels. More crucially, as Gramsci theorises, becoming part of the establishment, involves the subaltern (in this case the deviant art institution) first being hegemonised by the establishment (accepting the common sense that it promotes), before it can put a counter-hegemonic operation into motion. Since the mid 1990s, a number of state funded northern European art institutions have been operating a counter critical model to the traditional art institution. This process has been called new institutionalism, and refers to the internalising of institutional critique by the art gallery, resulting in self-reflexive and auto-critical institutions. Charles Esche, one of the leading proponents of the movement, has rather ambitiously described the project of new institutionalism, as 'nothing short of resisting the totality of global capitalism' (cited in Farquharson, 2006, p. 2). In this thinking, new institutions are deviant in relation to the neoliberal status quo. They are sites in which it is possible to think beyond the Denverbot of liberal democracy and imagine the world differently.

If we consider the new institutions' struggle in light of Gramsci's theory of hegemony, then the possibility arises that the subalterns (new institutions) can lead a struggle against the hegemon (traditional institutions) and, in effect, replace them. After all, as Gramsci reminds us (Jones, p. 47), the hegemon must accept challenges to its leadership from its subalterns.

Where Do They Stand?
Deviant Art Institutions and
the Liberal Democratic State

Emma Mahony

In this hypothesis, the new institution can potentially replace the neoliberal values of the state funded art institution with its own counter-critical ones.

In this war of position, the new institutions' strongest weapon is their criticality, however, as Nina Möntmann notes in her paper, 'The Rise of Fall of New Institutionalism' (2007, pp. 155-6), this criticality has not survived the recent 'corporate turn' in the institutional landscape. Möntmann lists a number of key new institutions that have disappeared from the map in the last few years. These include the Nordic Institute for Contemporary Art (NIFCA) in Stockholm (where Möntmann worked as a curator from 2003-6), which was closed in 2006, and the Contemporary Art Centre in Vilnius, which is suffering from severe budget cuts. Most surprising of all, is the fate of Rooseum, Malmö, the flagship new institution, which has become a branch of the expanding Moderna Museet in Stockholm. It would appear that in the above instances, the new institution failed in its goal to educate local politicians and funding bodies as to the importance of contesting the dominant ideology. That said, the values that these critical institutions embodied have not withered away. Individuals like Charles Esche and Manuel Borja-Villel, have recently transposed them onto the running of much larger, state-funded art museums.[8]

While Mouffe's strategy of 'critique as hegemonic engagement with' is appropriate for the new institution, it is less compatible with the self-organised initiatives of the panellists, with the notable exception of Valerie Connor's solo career as it developed after her involvement with Blue Funk ceased in 1993. Connor began working as a curator and visual arts' consultant for various state bodies: she has served on the board of IMMA (2005-10), was the visual arts adviser to the Arts Council/An Chomhairle Ealaíon (2006-10), and is currently chairperson for the National Campaign for the Arts. In her role as a visual arts adviser for established state-funded art institutions, Connor has the capacity to change the art institution from within.

For the other panellists, the strategy of engagement is less appropriate for a number of reasons. Firstly, they are not part of the establishment. Secondly, given the urgency of their modus operandi – their desire to make something happen right now – the strategy of engagement with its long war of position, is simply too time consuming. Exodus would therefore appear to be more compatible with their practices. It is certainly true that all of the panellists initially set out to create something else on the outside. There is a problem, however. True exodus necessarily involves an ideological decision not to engage with the state, full stop. In simple terms, this means refusing state funding, but it also involves renouncing commercial models (given that capitalism is the economic form of the liberal democratic state). For practical and financial reasons few self-organised initiatives chose to take this ideological stance. Some of the most critically interesting artist-led initiatives in Ireland, namely The Joinery, Block T, Monster Truck (all based in Dublin), The Good Hatchery (Offaly), and Occupy Space (Limerick) were all at one time in receipt of both Arts Council and local County Council funding. The panellists have also been in receipt of state funding at some point in their careers. There are, however, a small number of artist-led initiatives that survive on little or no capital, and are in receipt of no state funding. BASIC SPACE, Dublin, is one such example. Its two benefactors make its existence possible: the landlord of the warehouse they occupy off Thomas Street, and the NCAD (where the members are all full-time students). The former permits them use of a 10,000 square foot space, rent-free, and the latter pays for the insurance of the building. Of course, their relationship to the NCAD is, de facto, a relationship to the state, which contradicts the principles of exodus.

I propose that there are two possible methods by which a self-organised initiative can exist completely outside of the state. The first of these relies on Hakim Bey's (2008, pp. 100-10) understanding of the TAZ – a temporary autonomous zone (TAZ). A TAZ is a transitory site of

Where Do They Stand?
Deviant Art Institutions and
the Liberal Democratic State

Emma Mahony

resistance, a form of guerrilla operation, which temporarily liberates an area from the control of the state, before dissolving and re-appearing elsewhere. Crucially, Bey theorises the TAZ as an uprising, as distinct from a revolution. Where the latter is protracted, allowing for its possible recuperation by the state, the former is usually so short in duration that it evades recuperation. He argues that in its very failure, the uprising is a success, that it is a peak experience that creates fundamental changes, fissures and fault lines in the status quo, '…things have changed, shifts and integrations have occurred – a *difference* is made' (2008, p. 103). A TAZ likewise seeks to create these fault lines and to undermine the hegemonic order. It is a long-term counter-political strategy, which Bey believes will result in the eventual collapse of the hegemonic order.

We can link Bey's comprehension of the TAZ with Virno's conception of radical disobedience. Both declare an existence outside of the state, where the rules of the state do not apply. Therefore, by working on the principle of the TAZ, a self-organised initiative could temporarily occupy a public site until such time as the state forces it to move on, it could then emerge elsewhere, and so on. Social media could be used to alert audiences to the existence of what I call temporary autonomous exhibition sites. The second method by which an artist-led initiative can exist outside the state is based on Kojin Karatani's interpretation of Karl Marx's 'association of associations'. According to Karatani (2005, p. 165-6), the young Marx advocated that the state should be replaced by a type of association that was neither 'a traditional community', nor a 'state-centred organisation', but an 'association of free and equal producers'. He acknowledged that this association required a centre to prevent its dissent into anarchy, but he nonetheless refused the centre of state power, instead advocating a representative association of associations.

Karatani (2005, p. 284) returns to Marx's understanding of the association to propose an avenue towards a possible existence outside of the state today. He notes that our present economic reality – which is largely based around immaterial information industries, as opposed to material commodities, and where mammoth-sized corporations are being challenged by new types of monopolies – could now, more than at any time in the past one hundred years, support an association of cooperatives. The problem that this associationism would face is how to circumnavigate the issue of money, how to create a currency that does not transform into capital and generate interest. Marx never identified a solution to this problem, but Karatani (2005, p. 298-300) suggests one that is based on a Local Exchange Trading System (LETS).[9] LETS operates on the basis of interest free credit, and offers an alternative, non-capitalist arena, where members can trade their goods and services with other members. *Eflux*, the international art journal, launched a project called time/bank which operates on a similar principle but focuses on the unit of time and the skills that cultural workers may wish to exchange. It is possible, then, that self-organised initiatives that seek to exist outside of the state and not engage in capitalistic transactions could come together in an association of like-minded institutions that trade through a form of LETS or time/bank. In this scenario, an individual could build a wall or invigilate a gallery, and use the credit she/he has accumulated to have a press release written or an advertisement designed. This association of like-minded institutions would work best if it were drawn across all cultural institutions, and, just as Marx envisioned for his association of associations, it should also be global, thereby negating the importance of the nation-state.

As intriguing as these alternative strategies might be, they do not reflect the practices of the panellists. In her contribution to the discussion, Sarah Pierce very aptly described the relationship between her own self-organised practice and that of the established state-funded art institution as a form of 'non-aligned' alignment. By non-aligned alignment, she was referring

Where Do They Stand?
Deviant Art Institutions and
the Liberal Democratic State

Emma Mahony

to the manner in which her practice consciously operates at arm's length to the establishment. A similar strategy can be said to apply to the practices of Blue Funk, Garry and Phelan. Like Pierce, they all carefully negotiate their relationships with the establishment, and where they all recognise the benefits of a connection with it, they also seek to maintain a degree of autonomy from it. In this regard, the two extremes – autonomy and instrumentalisation – are constantly working in opposition to each other.

Pierce's concept of non-aligned alignment can be most clearly linked with the post-structuralist stance of taking an interstitial distance to the state. Just as Critchley and Konrád begrudgingly accept that the state is here to stay, the panellists acknowledge that their self-organised practices stand in what Esche (2004, p. 2) describes as 'an engaged-autonomous relationship' to the established state-funded art institution. By which he means they are necessarily located within the hegemony of the dominant social and economic order, but seek to act from a position of interstitial distance towards it. For Esche, this compromised position is potentially to their advantage, as it enables them to imagine things other than they are. Esche describes this ability to imagine things differently in terms of 'possibility'. He proposes an artistic paradigm, which he calls 'Modest Proposals', as a way to access the realm of possibility. These Modest Proposals, which he categorises as art projects that 'talk about what might be rather than what is' (2006, pp. 24-5), enable art and its publics to look beyond the current world order by illuminating the cracks in its façade.

Conclusion

It would appear that the degree to which deviant art institutions are state funded, directly affects their capacity to produce democratic discourse in opposition to the state. Exodus then is the only political strategy that guarantees complete autonomy from the state. While exodus ideally embodies the values of a deviant art institution, it is not a strategy that is available to the majority of critical art institutions because it involves severing all ties with the state. Essentially, this means both refusing state funding and renouncing any system of exchange that is based on the accumulation of capital.

In the absence of being able to set something up on the outside, many deviant art institutions have attempted to turn their engaged-autonomous relationship with the state to their advantage. This strategy is commensurate both with the activities of new institutions and self-organised initiatives. It has been shown, however, that the former are more susceptible to instrumentalisation by the state. As Möntmann points out, cuts in state funding, or their amalgamation into bigger umbrella institutions, has seen the demise of many state funded critical art institutions in recent years. While not dismissing the potential for new institutions to resist this increasingly pervasive instrumentalisation by the state and by capital, the post-structuralist stance of assuming an interstitial distance to the state offers a better alternative for these self-organised initiatives who prefer to operate at arm's length to the establishment. Operating from the ground up, rather than the top down, enables self-organised initiatives to better evade the rationalization procedures of the state.

The first task of the deviant art institution, then, is to show the establishment how things can be done differently, to reintroduce the emancipatory potential of art into the establishment. As Konrád writes in *Antipolitics*, 'The most effective way to influence policy is by changing a society's customary thinking patterns and tacit compacts, by bringing the pace-setters to think differently' (1984, p. 224). Alain Badiou (2005, p. xvii) expands on this point when he writes that the task of philosophy is to imagine things other than they are; to expose the gap between the world we live in and the world we *could* live in. Here, belief, not knowledge is the only thing

Where Do They Stand?
Deviant Art Institutions and
the Liberal Democratic State

Emma Mahony

that is certain. The deviant art institution must believe in its capacity to make a difference.

To acquire this belief, the deviant art institution must challenge what Habermas has termed the *Undurchsichtlichkeit* (the new opacity) of our present times and rehearse the ideas that Žižek defines as *Denkverbot*; those very ideas which are excluded by today's liberal-democratic hegemony. To order to think beyond this *Denkverbot* and operate deviantly, the art institution must subtract itself from its immersion in the hegemonic order, or as Morpheus puts it in the *The Matrix* (1999), it must unplug itself.

Emma Mahony is a PhD researcher in the faculty of Visual Culture at NCAD where she also currently teaches on graduate and undergraduate programmes. She has served as exhibitions curator for the Hayward Gallery, London.

NOTES

1.   *What Do You Stand For: Who's Afraid of Solidarity?* (2012) followed on from *What Do You Stand For?* (2011) – a day of presentations and discussions on artist-run initiatives in Ireland, held at the National College of Art and Design, Dublin. Both events were co-organised by Vaari Claffey and Francis Halsall.

2.   The Philanthropy Initiative was launched by Minister Deenihan in 2012 to incentivise arts organisations to proactively seek funding from the private sector. Under this initiative funding raised from the private sector is augmented by the state.

3.   Bartleby, the protagonist in Herman Melville's short story, *Bartleby, the Scrivener* (1853), uses the standard retort 'I would prefer not to', when asked to carry out tasks by his employer.

4.   Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri describe 'the multitude' as the unbounded subjects of Empire, they stand in contrast to the concept of 'the people' as the bounded subjects of a nation state.

5.   Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri describe Empire as a new global form of sovereignty comprised of a network of dominant nation states, supranational organisations and major corporations.

6.   It should be noted that Simon Critchley's understanding of the term civil disobedience is distinct from Paolo Virno's. For the former it is about breaking laws, and for the latter it is about calling their very validity into question.

7.   Mouffe's theory of agonism aims to reintroduce antagonisms into parliamentary politics in order to neutralize them. The issue that agonism seeks to address is how can conflict (between enemies) be legitimated and transformed into a political process. What Mouffe advocates is a set of democratic procedures agreed by the adversaries, which allows them to reach a 'conflictual consensus' (Mouffe 2005a, pp. 158-9).

8.   Charles Esche, formerly the director of Rooseum, Malmö (2002-4), is now the director of the van Abbemuseum in Eindhoven and Manuel Borja-Villel, who ran MACBA Barcelona from 1998-2007, is currently the director of the Reina Sofia in Madrid. They both apply the tenets of new institutionalism to the running of these state funded art museums.

9.   The Local Exchange Trading System (LETS) was initiated by Michael Linton in British Columbia in 1982.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Badiou, Alain (2005). *Metapolitics*. London/New York: Verso.

Bey, Hakim (2008). *The Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism: Anarchy and Conspiracy*. Charleston, South Carolina: Forgotten Books.

Critchley, Simon (2007). *Infinitely Demanding: Ethics of Commitment, Politics of Resistance*. London/ New York: Verso.

Esche, Charles (2004). *What's the Point of Art Centre's Anyway? – Possibility, Art and Democratic*

Where Do They Stand?
Deviant Art Institutions and
the Liberal Democratic State

Emma Mahony

Deviance [Online]. Available at http://republicart.net/disc/institution/esche01_en.htm [Accessed November 2011].

Farquharson, Alex (2006). *Bureaux de change [Online]*. Frieze no.101, September 2006. Available at http://www.frieze.com/issue/article/bureaux_de_change [Accessed September 2009].

Gordon-Nesbitt, Rebecca (2003), Harnessing the Means of Production. In: Ekeberg, Jonas (ed.) 2003. *New Institutionalism Verksted #1*. Norway: Office for Contemporary Art.

Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio (2001). *Empire.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio (2006). *Multitude.* London: Penguin Books.

Jones, Steve (2006). *Antonio Gramsci, Routledge Critical Thinkers*. London/New York: Routledge.

Karatani, Kojin (2005). *Transcritique: On Kant and Marx*. Sabu Kohso (trans). Cambridge, Massachusetts/London: The MIT Press.

Konrád, György (1984). *Antipolitics: An Essay*. Richard E. Allen (trans). London/Melbourne/New York: Quartet Books.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich (2002). *The Communist Manifesto*. London: Penguin Books.

Möntmann, Nina (2006). *The Enterprise of the Art Institution in Late Capitalism [Online]*. Aileen Derieg (trans.). Available at http://www.eipcp.net/transversal/0106/Moentmann/en [Accessed November 2011].

Möntmann, Nina (2007). The Rise and Fall of New Institutionalism: Perspectives on a Possible Future. In: Raunig, Gerald and Ray, Gene (eds.) 2009. *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice, Reinventing Institutional Critique.* London: MayFly Books.

Möntmann, Nina (2008). *Playing the Wild Child. Art Institutions in a Situation of Changed Public Interest. In: Art as a public issue: how art and its institutions reinvent the public dimension [Online]*. Open (14), Rotterdam: NAi Publishers. Available at http://classic.skor.nl/article-3631-nl.html?lang=en [Accessed November 2011].

Mouffe, Chantal (2002). For an Agonistic Public Sphere. In: Enwezor, Okwui, Basualdo, Carlos, Meta Bauer, Ute, Ghez, Susanne, Maharaj, Sarat, Nash, Mark and Zaya, Octavio (eds.) 2002. *Democracy Unrealized, Documenta11_Platform 1*. Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz.

-- (2005a). Which Public Space for Critical Artistic Practices. In: Steiner, Shepherd and Joyce, Trevor (eds.) 2005. *Cork Caucus: On Art, Possibility and Democracy*. Cork/Frankfurt: National Sculpture Factory/Revolver.

-- (2005b). Discussion, moderated by Ashley Hunt and Simon Sheikh. In: Steiner, Shepherd and Joyce, Trevor (eds.) 2005. *Cork Caucus: On Art, Possibility and Democracy*. Cork/Frankfurt: National Sculpture Factory/Revolver.

-- (2007). Artistic Activism and Agonistic Spaces [Online]. In: *Art and Research*. Vol 1. No. 2 Summer, 2007. Available at http://www.artandresearch.org.uk/v1n2/mouffe.html [Accessed October 2011].

-- (2008). *Critique as Counter-Hegemonic Intervention [Online]*. Eipcp. Available at http://translate.eipcp.net/transversal/0808/mouffe/en [Accessed November 2011].

Negri, Antonio (2009), *Insurgencies: Constituent Power and the Modern State*. Maurizia Boscagli (trans). Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.

Saramango, José (2007). *Seeing*. London: Vintage Books

Virno, Paolo (2004). *A Grammar of the Multitude*. Los Angeles: Semiotext.

Žižek, Slavoj (2009). *Violence: Six Sideways Reflections*. London: Profile Books.