Artists

JONAS STAAL
Sven Lütticken
Kim West

JONAS STAAL: RE-FORMING REPRESENTATION
Sven Lütticken

> You can conquer a place without occupying it. This is what is called a market.[1]

Adept at the art of self-definition, Jonas Staal has articulated complementary and overlapping conceptual frameworks for his practice. The first is that of Assemblism, which is predicated on a morphology of live assemblies; on the other hand, that of Organizational Art aims to foster emancipatory organisational structures.[2] These are interrelated concepts rather than mutually exclusive categories: Artist Organisations International, for instance, was an assembly at HAU (Hebbel am Ufer) in Berlin that presented a putative 'international' of artist organisations – practitioners of Organizational Art. In fact, Staal's practice is characterised by an attempt to go beyond the Occupy-style horizontal and spontaneist assembly *both* by designing assemblies more carefully so as to avoid endless and aimless debates, *and* by integrating them in long-term projects and emergent organisational structures.

Here, I will focus on the dialectical relation between specific assembly-forms – the summit, the parliament, the tribunal, the council – and organisational structures, as articulated in or suggested by Staal's work. My analysis centres on what I see as some of the fundamental parameters and strategies of his work, which means that I largely abstain from a more detailed reading of the proceedings and dynamics of individual projects. I argue that Staal consistently engages with forms of representation, and seeks to re-form them. Insofar as, according to Jacques Rancière, modern and contemporary art constitutes an *aesthetic regime* that breaks with the *representative regime of art*, this is not because modern art has ditched figuration for abstraction, or representation for pure form.[3] Rather, modern aesthetic practice de- and re-composes the forms of representation in more than one register – challenging, but not cancelling out, the divide between artistic work and political action.[4]

REPRESENTATIONAL DEMOCRACY?
The announcement of Staal's *New World Summit* (2012–ongoing) gatherings is worth parsing:

> The *New World Summit* is an artistic and political organization that develops parliaments with and for stateless states, autonomist groups, and blacklisted political organizations. The sixth summit, entitled *Stateless Democracy,* took the form of an assembly that explored the possibilities of uncoupling the practice of democracy from the construct of the nation-state.[5]

Here, then, the form of the national parliament gets grafted onto that of the international summit – in the form of a summit/parliament by an organisation named New World Summit. Staal has a long-standing critical engagement with the nation-state and its exclusions, leading to an alliance with various stateless and anti-state groups – with the unrepresented.

Previous page: Jonas Staal and Jan Fermon, *Collectivize Facebook: A Pre-Trial*, 2021. Photograph: Ruben Hamelink, Theater Rotterdam, produced by HAU Hebbel am Ufer, Berlin. Courtesy the artist

Modern art, literature, philosophy and politics have been haunted by representation – by its absence or by its presence, by its iron grip and its endless deferral. Representation has two adjectives that point to different, yet interrelated, meanings: *representational* and *representative*. The first relates to representation as *Darstellung* and the second to representation as *Vertretung*, or, respectively, to *portrait* and *proxy*, to use Gayatri Chakrabarty Spivak's terminology.[6] Raymond Williams once synthesised these two sides of representation by characterising the 'political representative' as 'the political image'.[7] Today, it is obvious that many people don't like the image of 'the political elite'. If there is a crisis of representative democracy, it is also a crisis of *representational* democracy – and of the modern nation-state as its supposedly natural host organism.

The political scientist Mahmood Mamdani asserts that 'nation' and 'state' are 'necessarily incompatible', since the state's law should apply equally to all citizens, whereas the nation and what it defines as its community privileges its members.[8] For all their 'universal values', modern nation-states have been marked by a 'differential inclusion' of minorities into the body politic.[9] Even when women, Jews or immigrants of Muslim descent get citizenship and voting rights, there remains a differential with the original representative of the universal subject – the white man. Today's progressive push for minorities to get representation in parliament as well as in the media and culture – so that they can 'see themselves' – is countered by an identity politics from the right: in the US, there is the hatred generated by the likes of Barack Obama or Ilhan Omar, which shows all too clearly that some politicians will never be truly representative in the eyes of those who conceive of 'the people' in ethnic terms. This is the condition attacked by theatre director Milo Rau with his General Assembly, which brought together the excluded in a counter-parliament, and by Staal with his New World Summit, which likewise re-forms the parliament.[10]

In the 1980s and early 1990s, the New York-based art collective Group Material engaged with political and cultural representation in ways that are pertinent to Staal's practice.[11] The critical post-modernists of that era drew on (post-)structuralism and cultural studies à la Stuart Hall to '[launch] a critique in which representation is shown to be more constitutive of reality than transparent to it'.[12] Many Group Material exhibitions articulate such a politics of representation, and in projects such as *Constitution* (1987) and *Democracy* (1988–89), the artists engaged with the promises and exclusions (or: differential inclusions) of American representative democracy. *Constitution* combined the text of the US constitution ('We, the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union') with a variety of artworks and other artefacts, while the similarly collaborative exhibition series *Democracy* was prepared in and accompanied by a number of 'town-hall meetings'.[13]

Here, Group Material invoked – and sought to deploy critically – an institution from American municipal politics that allows 'the people' (i.e. the voters) to speak directly to their elected representatives. Compared to regular 'town halls', those in the context of Democracy sought to provide a more fundamental form of critical feedback to the parliament as the site of representative politics as a site of abstraction through representation. As Group Material member Doug Ashford put it in a later text:

We live in a time in which abstraction, as a programmatic condition of modernist economies, has taken on an overwhelming and oceanic darkness. The violent terms of the debt economy have made finance the sole determination of who and where we are, even before we arrive. But strangely, at the core of democracy there is another, perhaps inverted, aspiration of abstraction: the idea of the empty room of politics. This is a non-specific space where nothing exists other than agonism. Known as the parliament, the forum, the congress hall, it is a place that demands to be filled with forms – with anything that can be said within the conditions of that room. From that place, ideas about how history could change or how subjectivity could reform itself would become thinkable.[14]

Following the distinction made by Chantal Mouffe, one may wonder if a parliament such as the US Congress is truly a forum for productive *agonism* between adversaries, or whether it is mostly dominated by carefully staged *antagonism* between enemies.[15] Here, Staal's parliaments clearly effect a morphological shift. It is not so much that Staal attempts to fill the existing parliament with forms; he forms alternative assemblies. This is not just a matter of their spatial layout, significant as that is. The ideal Staalian parliament has a circular layout, as in the 2012 New World Summit in Berlin, or indeed in *New World Summit–Rojava*, or the 'People's Parliament of Rojava'. Here, the 'circular form emphasises a communal politics' in which the transformation of agonism into factional antagonism is actively hindered. It may help that this is a people's parliament that is not an official part of the governing structures of Rojava, turning it into a performative arena where the revolutionary ideals are 'practiced on a day to day basis'.[16]

Whereas the Rojava parliament was built from scratch, most New World Summit meetings take place indoors in spaces that may impose their own limitations and parameters. The 2016 New World Summit took place in Utrecht University's medieval aula, its rectangular floor plan necessitating an architecture that is somewhat closer to the Westminster model of opposing benches. However, Staal distributed lecterns in such a manner that speakers were as it were popping up in different locations throughout the day(s), making participants and audience members acutely aware – sometimes uncomfortably so, on fairly rudimentary benches – of their embodied position in the space.

If the aim is not a ritualistic skirmish between opponents, then what do these assemblies do? What kind of agonistic space is this? More than any specific exchange, it is perhaps the very existence of the New World Summit as such that opens up an agonistic space insofar as it initiates a debate about the nature of representation and democracy. The New World Summit could thus indeed be seen as a formalist proposition. The proof of the pudding, here, is not so much in the eating as in the Instagram posts of an appetising-looking pudding. In a way, the New World Summit does not have to *work* as a space of debate and deliberation in order to have a right to exist; *it works by existing,* and by spawning media images and articles. In this way, it opens up an imaginary, a space to imagine politics otherwise.

PERSONHOOD ON TRIAL

The period of the French Revolution saw Constituent Assemblies in France and elsewhere – including the French-backed Batavian Republic in Holland – proclaim the unalienable rights of the human person. Around that time, philosophers theorized the dialectic of personhood and property as the basis for a free society. But who actually qualified to be a full person– a true 'unit of freedom', in Hegel's terminology? If women and people of colour were historically deemed less than a person, and excluded from full citizenship, by now much progress has been made – on paper. Instead of slaves stripped of their personhood, 'liberal democracies' now excel at the bio- or necropolitical management of 'illegal' immigrants and asylum seekers who are, certainly, not deprived of personhood, but without citizenship they are devoid of political rights and representation, and are all the more reliant on legal representation when dealing with the state apparatus.

In the context of the post-9/11 War on Terror, Muslim people and organisations could see themselves stripped of their rights overnight. The lawyer Nancy Hollander participated in New World Summits as 'legal representative' of the Holy Land Foundation, an American Muslim organisation, and Mohamedou Ould Slahi, a Mauritanian inmate of Guantanamo; at the Amsterdam Summit, Staal turned pages from his redacted prison diaries into banners. Staal thus emphasises the political implications of the language of legal representation. In a crucial early modern treatise of political theory, *Leviathan*, Thomas Hobbes did in fact theorise political representation through the prism of its juridical counterpart; for Hobbes, in both cases most rights lie with the representative, the *actor*, rather than with the *author* who actually or fictionally delegated the actor.[17] In politics, this author would be the people, who have little say in the decisions of their sovereign. In the juridical context, natural persons can be authors, but so can *personae fictae* such as organisations. Hobbes noted that 'there are very few things, that are uncapable of being represented by Fiction. Inanimate things, as a Church, a Hospital, a Bridge, may be Personated by a Rector, a Master, an Overseer.' However, since such inanimate things 'cannot be Authors' in the way that natural persons can, they 'cannot be Personated, before there be some state of Civill Government'.[18] The state and its legal framework are needed for the fiction to work.

Modern 'civill government' has in fact progressively increased the rights of corporations. In the late nineteenth century, American railroad corporations used the fourteenth amendment of the US Constitution, which decreed that all persons are equal so as to ensure the rights of formerly enslaved Black Americans, to argue that they, as juridical persons, should also have all the rights of natural persons.[19] By now, the motto 'corporations are people' has become right-wing dogma – and clearly, some persons are more equal than others. Formal equality before the law exists in a complicit relationship with substantial inequality. Some are born with the proverbial silver spoon, others will be lucky to even sell their labour-power at bargain prices. Meanwhile, natural organisms, ecosystems or the planet have a hard time being 'heard' in court or have 'standing' before the law.

Within the New World Summit, the presence of lawyers such as Nancy Hollander suggests that this summit/parliament has features in common with tribunals. The tribunal is a form of quasi-

juridical theatre in the court of public opinion. Other projects of Staal's, such as *Collectivize Facebook* (2020–ongoing, with the lawyer Jan Fermon) and *Court for Intergenerational Climate Crimes* (2021–22, with the writer and lawyer Radha D'Souza) relate more explicitly to the tradition of people's tribunals that is perhaps best encapsulated by the 1966–67 Russell Tribunals on war crimes in Vietnam, its 1974–76 successor on Latin America, or the 1976 International Tribunal on Crimes Against Women. Such tribunals can be termed *paralegal* in that their agency is not one of official juridical verdict; rather, they rely on the performativity of a certain quasi-juridical theatre.[20] Such tribunals are designed as a direct counterpart to a failing judiciary system, offering critical feedback that aims to help bring about a future justice worthy of that name.

Milo Rau's *Congo Tribunal* (2015–17) is a recent 'authored' version of such a tribunal, while the *NSU-Komplex auflösen* 'Unraveling the NSU Complex' series of tribunals (2017–ongoing) came out of a coalition of grassroots (migrant) organisations in which artists such as Natascha Sadr Haghighian and Forensic Architecture participated.[21] While *Collectivize Facebook and Court for Intergenerational Climate Crimes* recall Rau's *Congo Tribunal*, they are more abstract and speculative: they don't have specific war crimes as their object, but complex economic and temporal ones that are difficult to pin down in court. The *Court for Intergenerational Climate Crimes* takes the form of an installation serving as site for a 'more than human' tribunal. Ammonite fossils encased in oil and embroidered plants are part of the setting, and banners depicting extinct species (or 'comrades') hover above the heads of the human participants.[22] In contrast to some other attempts at creating an assemblism inspired by Bruno Latour's ideas, Staal does not indulge in literalist fantasies about humans directly speaking for such nonhuman others.[23] For better or worse, agency rests – unequally – with the various kinds of humans, though this universalising Western conception has itself become problematic.

The indictment of the *Collectivize Facebook* lawsuit is to be submitted to the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva. Irrespective of that assembly's response, *Collectivize Facebook* is primarily a trial in the court of public opinion. It bears some resemblance to *Enteignet Springer*, the 1966–67 campaign waged by the West-German student movement against the right-wing Springer newspaper empire – a campaign that was supposed to culminate in a tribunal, though this did not actually happen.[24] Compared to Springer, which came close to having a local newspaper monopoly, Facebook as global surveillance-capitalist behemoth has a different dimension – both in terms of global reach and in terms of its data mining at the nano level, creating profiles of its consumers in ways that allow for targeted rewiring of their brains. Among other things, the *Collectivize Facebook* indictment discusses the company's interfering in elections and the Cambridge Analytica scandal, concluding that, since traditional forms of state regulation have failed, 'infrastructures like Facebook (which, seeing its reputation in tatters, has now rebranded its holding company as Meta) need to be in the public domain, owned and controlled collectively and democratically by their users'.[25] What would such a collective control look like?

SOCIALISE FACEBOOK! CREATE DIGITAL COUNCILS!
Capitalism is an endemic and intensifying crisis of representation. For Marx, there is a fundamental disconnect between the 'natural form' of the commodity and its 'value-form'. A coat is a concrete

physical object, but the value-form reduces the coat to pure equivalence: '20 yards of linen = one coat.'[26] *Capital* is an ambitious attempt to represent the totality of capitalism, and to demystify the commodity fetish and counter the seeming autonomy of the value-form. The real value of the coat is not due to some magically established equivalence with other commodities (such as the 20 yards of linen), but by the labour-power invested in it. While exchange value is the *form* taken by value, socially necessary labour-time is its *substance*. However, since this substance is not apparent from the value-form, the massive theoretical edifice of *Capital* was needed to restore the referent that is labour.

Neoclassical economics broke with Marx and replaced labour value with perceived or subjective value, quantified in concepts such as 'marginal utility'; this results in a balance of supply and demand. Neoclassical economics thus effects an occlusion of labour and a fixation on exchange, on the value-form. The so-called Great Socialist Calculation Debate that took off in 1917–20 saw left-wing economists and politicians argue for a socialisation of the economy not on the basis of any Marxist model, but on the basis of Neoclassical marginalism. According to these authors, neoclassical models were universally applicable. The state or state institutions could balance supply and demand and determine prices just as well as 'the market' – or better. By contrast, the Austrian School of Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich Hayek insisted that neoclassical economics and markets were *not* universal, but in fact specifically capitalist. Thus neoclassical universalism met its match in Austrian neoliberal binarism: on the one hand was 'socialism', on the other the 'market economy'.[27]

Of course the meaning of 'socialism' and of 'socialisation' were anything but clear and uncontested during the Socialist Calculation Debate. State socialists believed in centralised coordination, while others subscribed to council-communist models – though the council as social form could also be integrated into centralist conceptions, for instance by philosopher Otto Neurath. The latter advocated a moneyless economy in kind, while others insisted on the need for prices and for money.[28] After all, money and the value-form are transhistorical, and long predate capitalism. If capitalism was marked by the *generalisation* of the value-form and its takeover of the productive relations, then what further historical transformations are possible? What would post-capitalist value look like, which is to say: how would it work?

Such questions are far from arcane, now that the crisis of value is intensifying in an economy marked by automation and AI, by unpaid work for surveillance-capitalist platforms, and by ecological spoliation. In this context, Staal and Fermon's *Collectivize Facebook* resonates with the work of authors such as Daniel Saros, Evgeny Morozov and Dan McQuillan.[29] Against nostalgia for central planning, Morozov insists on councils as the basis of a digital feedback infrastructure, while McQuillan argues for a collectivised AI that is not predictive but *prefigurative*; instead of being in the service of better ways to model and monetise reality, it is used to change it along emancipatory lines.[30] In keeping with a long history, McQuillan insists that people's councils and worker's councils are 'not a reconfiguring of representative democracy. People's councils are not representative because they challenge the validity of representation, but they are transformative because they are constitutive of a different commonality.'[31]

In the 1910s and 1920s, as around 1968, the council form functioned as a concrete utopia that was as aesthetic as it was political; for the Situationists, for instance, the council promised an overcoming of capitalist and bourgeois democratic structures through direct participation. Realising this concrete utopia proved difficult.[32] And today? How to organise digital councils with vast numbers of users that are scattered across a global network? Can the democratic confederalism of Rojava provide pointers at this scale? Could such a digital council be shaped using the blockchain, as a Decentralised Autonomous Organization, even though the ideological presuppositions of right-wing techno-libertarianism are baked into its digital DNA, and its carbon footprint is catastrophic?[33] And who gets to participate in such councils? Users and other post-Fordist workers? What about all the unglamorous and unhealthy 'upstream' work that goes into the creation and maintenance of a tech platform, much of it which occurs in the Global South?[34] *Collectivize Facebook* doesn't answer such questions, or even ask them in explicit terms, but it helps to make them thinkable – and provides a platform for their agonistic discussion and elaboration.

1   Édouard Glissant, *Treatise on the Whole-World* (trans. Celia Britton), Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2020, p.49.

2   See Jonas Staal, 'Assemblism', *e-flux journal*, no.80, March 2017, available at https://www.e-flux.com/journal/80/100465/assemblism/ (last accessed on 31 May 2021); on organisational art, see the website of Artists Organisations International intiated by Staal with curators Florian Malzacher and Joanna Warsza, http://www.artistorganisationsinternational.org/ (last accessed on 31 May 2021); see also Staal's 'Organizational Art Training Manual' in his essay 'Contagion Propagations', Maria Hlavajova and Sven Lütticken (ed.), *Deserting from the Culture Wars*, Utrecht and Cambridge, MA: BAK, basis voor actuele kunst and MIT Press, 2020, pp.142–50.

3   Rancière has critiqued just such a simplistic account (associated with the notion of 'modernity', which for him is a misunderstanding of the aesthetic regime) of modern art: 'The basis for this simplistic historical account was the transition to non-figurative representation in painting. This transition was theorized by being cursorily assimilated into artistic "modernity's" overall anti-mimetic destiny. [...] The leap outside of mimēsis is by no means the refusal of figurative representation. Furthermore, its inaugural moment has often been called realism, which does not in any way mean the valorization of resemblance but rather the destruction of the structures within which it functioned. Thus, novelistic realism is first of all the reversal of the hierarchies of representation (the primacy of the narrative over the descriptive or the hierarchy of subject matter) and the adoption of a fragmented or proximate mode of focalization, which imposes raw presence to the detriment of the rational sequences of the story.' Jacques Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible* (trans. Gabriel Rockhill), London: Continuum, 2004, p.24.

4   How Staal's politico-aesthetic practice functions in between and across aesthetic and in political registers would deserve to be examined at length. Obviously, Staal's work does not 'settle' the debate about aesthetics and activism, and about art and politics. Neither Staal, nor anybody else, can resolve fundamental historical antinomies through sheer willpower or chutzpah, but I would maintain that Staal navigates, articulates and forms (*gestaltet*) those antinomies better than most. This obviously does not prevent his practice from having limitations and contradictions, and moments of breakdown as well as resolution. An immanent, dialectical critique also needs to address those; here, concerned as I am with outlining certain basic features of the work as a basis for further discussion, I can only hint at such a critique.

5   Jonas Staal, 'New World Summit – Utrecht', Aula, Utrecht University, 29–31 January 2016, available at http://www.jonasstaal.nl/projects/new-world-summit-utrecht/ (last accessed on 31 May 2021).

6   Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 'Can the Subaltern Speak? Speculations on Widow Sacrifice', *Wedge*, no.7–8, 1985, pp.123–30.

7   Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, revised edition, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1983, p.267.

8   Mahmood Mamdani, *Neither Settler nor Native: The Making and Unmaking of Permanent Minorities*, Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2020, p.7.

9   Ariella Aïsha Azoulay, *Potential History: Unlearning Imperialism*, London and New York: Verso, 2019, p.133.

10   See Milo Rau/International Institute of Political Murder, *General Assembly*, Leipzig: Merve Verlag, 2017.

11   As Hito Steyerl puts it, 'The assumption went something like this: if people were represented culturally in a positive way, political equality would become more likely. Passionate battles over the idea of a politics of representation characterized a large part of the '80s (and in many places, way beyond them).' Hito Steyerl, 'Let's Talk About Fascism', *Duty-Free Art*, London and New York, Verso, 2017, p.174.

12   Hal Foster, '(Post)Modern Polemics', *Recodings: Art, Spectacle, Cultural Politics*, Seattle and Washington: Bay Press, 1985, p.121.

13   See the documentation in Julie Ault (ed.), *Show and Tell: A Chronicle of Group Material*, London: Four Corners Books, 2010, pp.126–31 and 138–55; see also, Brian Wallis (ed.), *Democracy: A Project by Group Material*, Seattle: Bay Press, 1990.

14   'Maria Lind Talks to Doug Ashford', in Doug Ashford, *Writings and Conversation*, Graz and Milan: Grazer Kunstverein and Mousse, 2013, pp.15–16.

15   See Chantal Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox*, London and New York: Verso, 2000, p.13.

16   See http://www.jonasstaal.nl/projects/new-world-summit-rojava/.

17   Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1651) (intro. and notes Christopher Brooke), London: Penguin Classics, 1985, pp.217–22.

18   *Ibid*., p.219.

19   This is the subject of artist Zachary Formwalt's project *A Legal Fiction*; the script was published in the journal *Kunstlicht*, vol.40, no.1–2, 2019, pp.31–48.

20   This is a form of *détournement* on my part of the term paralegal, which usually refers to individuals performing delegated legal work under the supervision of lawyers.

21   See https://forensic-architecture.org/investigation/the-murder-of-halit-yozgat (last accessed on 15 September 2021).

22   *Court for Intergenerational Climate Crimes* is presented at Framer Framed in Amsterdam from 24 September 2021–13 February 2022. At the 2019 meeting of the Interplanetary Species Society in a disued underground nuclear reactor in Stockholm, Staal had already made an assemblage of human participants, ammonites (as 'comrades' in deep time), meteorite splinters and depictions of 'proletarian' plantae from the Chinese Cultural Revolution. See http://jonasstaal.nl/projects/interplanetary-species-society/ https://forensic-architecture.org/investigation/the-murder-of-halit-yozgat (last accessed on 15 September 2021).

23   For an example of such an approach, see the Embassy of North Sea (2018–ongoing), https://www.embassyofthenorthsea.com/.

24   For an excellent reconstruction and analysis, see Dae Sung Jung, *Der Kampf gegen das Presse-Imperium. Die Anti-Springer-Kampagne der 68er-Bewegung*, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2016.

25   Collectivize Facebook, 'Indictment: The People(s) vs. Facebook', available at https://collectivize.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/collectivize_indictment_ENG.pdf (last accessed on 15 September 2021).

26   Karl Marx, *Capital, Volume I: A Critique of Political Economy* (trans. Ben Fowkes), London: Penguin and New Left Review, 1990. See especially chapter 1.2–3. See also David Harvey's useful gloss in *A Companion to Marx's Capital: The Complete Edition*, London and New York: Verso, 2018, pp.17–49.

27   Johanna Bockman, *Markets in the Name of Socialism: The Left-Wing Origins of Neoliberalism*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011, pp.17–19.

28   *Ibid*., p.26.

29   See Daniel E. Saros, *Information Technology and Socialist Construction: The end of capital and the transition to socialism*, London and New York: Routledge, 2014.

30   Evgeny Morozov, 'Digital Socialism? The Calculation Debate in the Age of Big Data', *New Left Review*, no.116–17, March – June 2019, pp.33–67 (in particular pp.53–67); Dan McQuillan, 'Deep Bureaucracy and Autonomist AI', M. Hlavajova and S. Lütticken (ed.), *op. cit*., pp.227–41.

31   D. McQuillan, *ibid*., p.239.

32   It is Oskar Negt who characterised councils as the concrete utopia of the twentieth century in '50 Jahre Institut für Sozialforschung', (unauthorised) transcript of lecture, University of Frankfurt, 4 July 1974, in Alexander Kluge and Oskar Negt, *Kritische Theorie und Marxismus*, The Hague: Rotdruck, 1974, p.119.

33   Adam Greenfield, *Radical Technologies: The Design of Everyday Life*, London and New York: Verso, 2017, pp.169–70.

34   On this important point, see Vinit Agarwal, 'Collectivize Facebook and Other Electric Dreams', *Rosa Mercedes*, no.2, 21 May 2020, available at https://www.harun-farocki-institut.org/en/2020/05/21/collectivize-facebook-and-other-electric-dreams-2/ (last accessed on 16 September 2021).

Above: Studio Jonas Staal, *New World Summit – Utrecht*, 2016. Photograph: Nieuwe Beelden Makers Utrecht University, produced by BAK, basis voor actuele kunst, Utrecht. Courtesy the artist

Previous page: Jonas Staal and Jan Fermon, *Collectivize Facebook*, 2021, installation. Photograph: Bienal de Arte Paiz Guatemala, 22nd Bienal de Arte Paiz Guatemala: Lost. In Between. Together. Courtesy the artist

Group Material, *Democracy*, 1988–89.
Courtesy Group Material/Four Corners Books

Group Material, *Constitution*, 1987.
Photograph: Gregory Benson.
Courtesy Group Material/Four Corners Books

**Democratic Self-Administration of Rojava
and Studio Jonas Staal,** *New World Summit
– Rojava,* **2015–18. Photograph: Ruben
Hamelink, Dêrik, Canton Cizîrê, Rojava.
Courtesy the artist**

Jonas Staal, *New World Summit –
Berlin*, 2012, Photograph: Lidia Rossner
Sophiensaele Berlin, produced by 7th Berlin
Biennale. Courtesy the artist