

For the theory, as suggested by Gadamer, facts are a hermeneutical notion, that is, they are related to certain apprehensions and expectations, and the theoretical work, as a reflection on facts or “watching that which is,” is not a mere establishing of the number of something, but a keeping on of one's attention regarding some subject, a persistence in a certain attitude, a spelling of opinions, so the theory turns out to be a worthwhile and useful activity.¹

How are we than, *in terms of that which is*, to discern, describe or explain the design in the transition? Well, there are several ways to approach this: (1) as a material practice whereby one determines one's own habits, as well as patterns of thinking and acting, in the function of nonviolent dominance over subordinated classes; (2) as an entirety of types and units of particular serial production; (3) as a structure or order of signifiers of a certain power discourse (“power speaks, and that is the rule”); (4) as a media, that is, as an artificial means of mediation between production of signs and consumption; (5) as a way of material existence of some ideology in the light or the shadow of the process through which countries of noncompetitive economy transform their political and economic order; (6) as a plan, prototype or an outline in the production of new types of goods; and so forth.

Therefore, we are interested in the factuality of the state of design in the countries which constituted of the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia. Feđa Vukić elaborates that in the self-management socialism theoretico-critical ideas for various projects in the industrial production were based on a modernist conception of the universal creative humanism. Designer practice was confronted with tasks which concerned “all levels of social communication, from articulation of urban environment to the ethics of interpersonal relations.”² In principle, design included industrially produced objects and their assortments, means and conditions of processing of their production, all systems, processes and media of communication, and also the space for working and for living. The bottom line of most theoretico-critical conceptions of design in Yugoslavia was that the stylistic and fashion features could not be taken as qualitative determinations, since they, as class constrictions, harmed once too often the essential interests and conceptions of design. For that reason, the products designed to find their way to the consumer in shortest period possible, based solely on stylistic innovations, were of the least value possible. The changes in style, without structural and functional improvements, are nothing other

¹ Hans Georg Gadamer, *Pobvala teoriji*, Podgorica, Oktoih, 1996, p. 20–21.

² Feđa Vukić, „Od oblikovanja do dizajna“, in Feđa Vukić (ed.), *Od oblikovanja do dizajna: teorija i kritika projektiranja za industrijsku proizvodnju*, Zagreb, Meandar, 2003, p. 42.

than an agent of artificial becoming old-fashioned of the product and a way to manipulate the customer. As opposed to that, the designer should serve the consumers, and not to create an illusion about qualitative shift through mere innovations in design. His task consists in coordinating the work of several subjects in production, wherein the analysis and creation of particular forms is of secondary importance, and more a job of a stylist than of a designer. The greater designer's respect for technological, medical and ecological standards, the higher the quality of product attained, and the highest possible criteria with regard to the product are met if it is designed so that it structures optimal relations between man and his environment. The industrial design implies humanisation of the technical progress, while the basic method of a designer's work must be the radical critique of everything existent. The goal of the design is to harmonize both the production and the distribution of goods with socio-political orientation of the community.³

According to Matko Meštrović, the practice of projecting the processes and the objects of industrial production should have been altered into a system of organizing and planning of environment. The environment is one's physical, political and aesthetic surrounding, so the environmental design is also "the new ideological position," and not just some other realm of applying diverse disciplines of design. The environmental design is opposed to isolated systems of competition which form the basis of the design in capitalism. The capitalist economies are characterized by the class antagonism and separation of the intellectual work and physical labour. All this should be dissipated by the abolition of private capital and through building of socialism. It was also stated that: "Self-management truly means the anticipation of the society of future, hence it entails, as well, essentially different material civilization than the one we are witnessing in current history."⁴

However, it was Meštrović himself that, in the beginning of the 90s, reached the conclusion that capitalist economy was capable of putting restrictions to revolutionary regimes and has discredited socialism. He suggested, at that time (towards the end of the self-management), that new media technologies were not capable either of structuring qualitatively new relation of productive forces and of putting an end to the division of labor.⁵ One question emerges: what are the objectives of a designer now, or more precisely since 1991, when a social, political and cultural model of organizing the community practically ceased to exist, and when design – accompanied by the crisis of industrial sector – became the agent of transition of the non-orthodox state-socialism into the global capitalist system.

³ See Goroslav Keler, *Dizajn*. Zagreb, Vjesnik, 1975.

⁴ Matko Meštrović, *Teorija dizajna i problemi okoline*, Zagreb, Naprijed, 1980, p. 11.

⁵ See Matko Meštrović, *Roba i sloboda*, Zagreb, Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1995.

But, first and foremost, what is the transition?

Transition is the notion which defines passing from the command-based (central-planned and self-management) to the market-based system of economy. Transition is in fact the intersection of two fields in crisis – the decaying state socialism and parliamentary democracy on the rise. It is widely acknowledged that in this intersection private interest is given free hand, while the impact of the state on society and market dwindles. In other words, the state in transition has given up on planning, the economy is surrendered to the private owners, and the society is forced to look after itself. Sociality is thus reduced to an effect of extremely chaotic processes of the autoregulation of the market. As for the state, it regards itself somewhat unfitting to be the source of a political ideology. It is supposed to provide the guidance through the periods of crisis, or to alleviate crisis, in function of the circulation of the capital. State, as Tomislav Medak says, doesn't take "sociality for a cause, but for a consequence."⁶

On the other hand, the transition can be viewed using Foucauldian optics, and in doing so it seems that the interventions on the part of the governmental authorities upon society have not ceased, but are determined otherwise: not through party directive, but in the shadow of the neoliberal democracy, according to a calculus that is economic or prison-like.

The spreading of capitalism takes place, in broad terms, from the 18th century, especially after the industrial revolution. During the 19th century, capitalism reproduces itself in pair with imperialism, and this is the case until the World War II, when the strategy of expansion of the system is alternatively established: through the global multinational and corporate economy. Finally, the global capitalism, coupled with the informational technologies of today, is almost deprived of its outerness. If locomotive was the key element of the industrial revolution, electricity and internal-combustion engines to imperialism, main technologies of today are those of management and communication. Fredric Jameson explains that these technologies "at the same time produce new types of goods, just as they are instrumental of the opening of the new global spaces, thus *shrinking* the planet and reorganizing the capitalism proportionally to its new scope."⁷ Globalization suddenly interferes into politics, economy and elsewhere. In fact, within the realm of the national there originate new "spacialities and temporalities" that are nothing other than traces or seeds of the global. Global and local permeate rather than exclude each other. For example, an enterprise, previously managed by the state (through general plans or

⁶ Tomislav Medak, "Društvena proizvodnja i transformacija kulturne proizvodnje", *Upečunderground/ Art dossier*, 7/8, Zagreb, Bijeli val, 2004, p. 105.

⁷ Frederic Jameson, "Five Thesis on Actually Existing Marxism," translated in *Prelom: časopis za sliku i politiku*, 6-7, Belgrade, Prelom kolektiv, 2001, p. 47.

directives), now even without its mediation acts as an element of a networked and global economy. The notions like *liberalization* and *privatization* signify gradual renouncing of the management of the economy on the part of the governance. State is reduced to an administrative apparatus persisting as long as a more useful alternative is not found.⁸

And what would be the usefulness benefit of the state in the transition?

Transition takes place through the transformations in relations of production and it is state's function to regulate conflicts stemming from systematic contradictions of emergent capitalism. Rastko Močnik thinks that the extra-economic coercion remains an underlying premise of the system of the world economy. It is also an agent in transition, that is, it is a *stake* in the establishment of the social relations based on private ownership. In the post-communist societies new ruling classes heading for liberalism have taken shape. This new ruling classes, as Močnik explains, "must adopt liberal ideology as a cohesive element in their relation towards metropolises, a relation in which they are a subordinated partner or, simply, a client."⁹ The neoliberal ideology is thus embodied on the very spot where its effects are mostly harmful, that is, on the fringes of the European economy. This peripheral neoliberalism, curiously enough, is inseparable from nationalism. Therefore (*in den Schluchten des Balkan*): "the ideology of those in power is neoliberalism, whereas the ideology in power – today still – is nationalism."¹⁰

The ruling ideology rests upon the ideological apparatuses of the state (as described by Althusser), whereas the ideology of those who rule is *exclusive* political doxa of some sovereign party or party alliance. In short: on the one hand there is a neoliberal ideology, as ideology of those who rule, and on the other there's nationalism which is ideology of subordinated and which, by *the very nature of things*, comes from the nation itself.

What is one to make of this *ideological twofoldness*? According to Slavoj Žižek: "Each historical break, each enthronement of the master-signifier, retroactively changes the meaning of the entire tradition, it structures anew the narratives of the past and subjects them to new, different readings."¹¹ If the transition is to be regarded "a historical break," then the peoples, which (in the transition) obtain their state, have two new (but not the only) "master-signifiers" – which penetrate the present and past sights of the meaning.

⁸ See Saskia Sassen, *Protugeografije globalizacije*, Zagreb, Multimedia Institute, 2003.

⁹ Rastko Močnik, *Koliko fašizma?*, Zagreb, Arkzin, 1999, p. 59.

¹⁰ Rastko Močnik, *Tri teorije: ideologija, nacija, institucija*, Belgrade, Centre for Contemporary Art, 2003, p. 183.

¹¹ Slavoj Žižek, *Sublimni objekt ideologije*, Zagreb, Sarajevo, Arkzin & Društvo za teorijsku psihoanalizu, 2002, p. 84.

Liberalism aims at subjecting the state and politics to the laws of profit. The first “master-signifier,” hence, belongs to liberalism, precisely as a doxa of governance. The calculation of the governance in liberalism is conforming profit itself and, strictly speaking, serves to correct the fall of the profit rate. One should economize with power, in terms of the calculations of utility of the governance. The governance is thus restricted, and is not granted the possibility of governing the market. In liberalism the market must be free, and as such it is the agent of the state. Foucault argues (and *we*, on the other hand, firmly claim so) that the imposed liberalism itself is extremely state-formative, and that liberal state is not above the market but rather instrumental to it. And what is the state then supposed to have an impact on, if not the market? Well, the population, of course. The governance is interested in population and it intervenes within it, by way of social care and scrutiny. Thus the society subjected to competing dynamics is brought about, the society wherein every individual expects his/her ownership (including one’s abilities and physical wellness) to bring income, the society, therefore, in which every individual is an “enterprise” and, as it were, a merchant. Thus, the worker is a *homo aeconomicus*, an independent entrepreneur who is supposed to be useful to him/herself and others, who manages the risks of production and produces his/her own gratification, and who, in the end, is unable to see the limit of interests (“the world of economy should be dim”). His/Her behavior is economic and as such it is submitted to control. The civil society is in fact the society of economic individuals. One thing becomes obvious: “the mechanism of making the individual, of making the children thus may have the entire economic and social problematic based on the issue of very rare occurrence of good genetic predispositions.”¹² To be an enterprise means to make sense of one’s relation towards one’s belongings, family, life, as some kind of permanent and multifaceted profit-making enterprise.

The other “master-signifier” is one which belongs to the nation, and from Močnik we know that “the life in a nation is truly a life in a dungeon.”¹³ The nation unites population and delimits it towards others. The nation separates itself from institutions similar to itself (other nations), and includes all other institutions (institution of art, sport etc.). That is why the national state is represented as a defensive organization of social structure, and as such it enables unconditional identification of individuals with the particular institution which successfully imposes itself as an integrating agent of national identity. The struggle between particular institutions (e.g. political parties) *differentiates* representations which repress the traumas that emerged through uneven distribution of commodity equivalents or means for production of commodities.

¹² Michel Foucault, *Radanje biopolitike: predavanja na Kolež de Fransu*, Novi Sad, Svetovi, 2005, p. 313.

¹³ Rastko Močnik, *Alterkacije: alternativni govori i ekstravagantni članci*, Beograd, Biblioteka XX vek, 1998, p. 204.

According to Močnik, that which manifests itself as a transition from one-party system to the system of parliamentary democracy, is determined by the transformation of the relations of production. Firstly, we have here the crisis of the withering state socialism – crisis, as it were, of the *final times of socialism* – and also the crisis of the independence (of the states) that originated in *that times*. The transition that we have is the involvement of a certain socio-economic space, as defined by non-orthodox version of the state socialism, into the order of capitalism. The transformation, under the disguise of privatization, is legally and otherwise regulated by the state. Thus the role of the state as a guardian of the institution of community and social solidarity is terminated, in favor of a state with the objective of regulating the conflicts engendered within the transformation of the relations of production. The relations of production established in the transition are the relations of exploitation, and, it goes without saying, the relations between antagonistic classes. When an antagonism that could not be articulated within the court, and can not be delayed, has arisen, the situation is resolved through some extra-economic instance. I have in mind here the repressive measures put in practice by the state when the class struggles become impossible to “channel into the proceedings of parliamentary democracy or into some extra-parliamentary negotiatory (provisional) solution.”¹⁴ The *freedom* of the market is realized here by economic pressures, political extortion, police and military intervention. The state in the transition, for that reason, acts as the state which is in the state of exception.¹⁵ It is misleading to even think that the state can operate as a shelter from emerging new relations of production. On the contrary, it is *there* to serve the reproduction of the capitalism, that is, to accomplish economic, political and even military objectives. It is: “an operative element in the functioning of the global system, wherein it can create the conditions of *the unequal international distribution* and pockets of safe haven for investment, through legal regulations it can depreciate the value of labor force, by omitting respective laws it can lower ecological standards, via local politics it can create and regulate new markets of commodities, agents of production and labor force, etc.”¹⁶ The statehood of the former Yugoslav republics and provinces *failed to perceive* the role which was given by the *new* national (or *multinational*) state – the role of dependent subject whose economic weakness is structured by the state borders. At the same time, various local resistances perceive the state as the barrier against mentioned changes in the relations of production. That is why almost all political struggles, within the state borders, are led along division line between, if that’s a proper thing to say, those consistent and those inconsistent when faced with the plagues of the

¹⁴ Rastko Močnik, *Koliko fašizma?*, Zagreb, Arkzin, 1999, p. 13.

¹⁵ On the phenomenon of the state of exception see Carl Schmitt, „Pojam političkog“ and „Politička teologija: četiri poglavlja o teoriji suverenosti“, in *Norma i odluka: Karl Šmit i njegovi kritičari*, Belgrade, Filip Višnjić, 2001.; see also Giorgio Agamben, *Homo sacer*, Zagreb, Multimedijalni institut, Arkzin, 2006.

¹⁶ Rastko Močnik, *Koliko fašizma?*, Zagreb, Arkzin, 1999, p. 16.

peripheral capitalism. Both political alibis (neo-liberal and nationalist) are in the same plane – they conceal class differences and delay conflicts possible to escalate as a result of the class oppression. The switching of places in that plane is a legitimate political means, but that is no contradiction, because: “The logic of liberalism is not in contradiction with the authoritarianism, neither from within, nor on the global scale.”¹⁷ The governance is deprived of (political) truth. It is a simulacrum (by all means) and is kept alive only by crisis. But the crises are not sufficient, so the governance must produce them in order to have something to attend to. It is still the case of the monopoly of a political class, but it is complete only if the governance is divided and legitimated by the act of election. The public sphere is shaken, degraded into “the glorification of a good-natured feeble-mindedness of the righteous civil subject,” through discursive mechanisms of “today’s futuristic technicism.”¹⁸ Politics is reproduced (via machine) and put into mouth, not just here but elsewhere also, of the people who do not speak, because their voice is taken away. It seems that Benjamin was after this.

What remains now for us is to distinguish the mechanisms of “today’s futuristic technicism” which we have just referred to. Let us start with the line set by Gillo Dorfles, who defined design as something proper to machines and serial production. According to Dorfles, design is a condition and result of every reproduction and, at the same time, an activity opposed to craftsmanship. The seriality of the production means in fact the capability for the repeated manufacture of the standardized model. Each phase of the production based on a designer project must be processed, so that in repeating the same action we end up with the result typical for every single item of the series. Also, the process of production has to be completely mechanical.¹⁹ It appears that this *limitation* does not enclose design into some final set, but that it constantly shifts, following the inertia of the transformations in the process of production. Hence, all that through some software algorithm can be translated from one into another digital recording proves intrinsic to the design. The informations used by computer to accomplish the tasks are digital recordings (variables) in specific memory unit, and so every work in the “new media” surroundings involves constructing the interface on the basis of a database. The constant growth of the number of available informations along with the multiplication of the ways to connect them make it impossible to isolate particular output or a mode of processing the data as an evaluation criteria.²⁰ Contemporary designer also designs that which we call the brand, understood as objects, proceedings, customs or personalities made familiar to and wanted by many. The subject and the object of the design are increasingly indiscriminate. “Because, today,”

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 61.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 18-19.

¹⁹ See Gillo Dorfles, *Uvod u dizajn: jezik i istorija serijske proizvodnje*, Novi Sad, Svetovi, 1994.

²⁰ See Lev Manovich, *Metamediji: izbor tekstova*, Belgrade, Centre for Contemporary Art, 2001.

as Hal Foster explains, “you don't have to be filthy rich to be projected not only as designer but as designed – whether the product in question is your home or your business, your sagging face (designer surgery) or your lagging personality (designer drugs), your historical memory (designer museums) or your DNA future (designer children).”²¹

The design is a matter of usefulness, and users, only by their personal feeling, which means in consumption, judge its quality. But, a user can succeed in appeasing his/hers whims with the design only when taking into consideration the meaning itself. The meaning is being grasped within the symbolic, in which the signifier (design) makes itself present only in order to give itself to the subject, and in order to build the subject (by the desire of the Other). If the esthetic feature of the object is ideologically situated, the design is the mode of industrial production of the ideological as an esthetic output. The design is the order (of signifiers) mirroring a society that spends and produces (the meaning). The design is the commodity which in some respect tells or represents a certain ideology. The designed itself – in accordance with evaluation criteria – conceptualizes, produces and presents itself as beautiful, that is as the beautiful which is undistinguishable from the utilitarian.

We're now, therefore, supposed to differentiate what defines the design as useful or pleasing (as an environment when working and relaxing). We will also point out what are the discursive moments (meanings and narratives) and signifiers (forms, visual representations, icons) of the design since the end of the one-party system. Let's have it one at a time:

1) To designate the narratives and doxas of the design in the transition, a recourse to the antique, byzantine, bogumil, islamic, romanic and gothic art is made. It's a matter of the typographical and other forms of the graphic design, as well as other decoration objects, the furniture and small architectural decoration which is endlessly reproduced (by machines). What is the function of all these forms of design? It's a matter of models of classification and accumulation of signifiers which illustrate the narrative of ethno-genesis. The national culture thus affirms and reflects upon itself (as Central European versus Balkan, or whatever other way). The design is then a screen meant to record, confirm and create the history of a nation. This implies a sort of enjoyment in the past, for it is exactly “the thought about our origin that calms us.”²² The design supports the historiographies which offer *new* readings of history. It is an act which Žižek defines as construction of the past retroactively. A scene from the past is

²¹ Hal Foster, *Design and Crime (and Other Diatribes)*, London, Verso, 2003, p. 18

²² Rolan Bart, *Svetla komora*, Beograd, Rad, 2004, p. 102.

retroactively encompassed by the meaning, and after subsequent intervention on the part of the subject (in this case by designing) it becomes “that which it has always been.”²³

2) The narratives and doxas of design in the transition are used to designate the art forms originated during the years of “the People’s Liberating War“ (1941–45), and the forms of socialist realism – as didactic, memorial, portrait and agit-prop art. The socialist realism was the politico-programmatic art of the post-war Yugoslavia, that is “the dogmatic follower and heir of the left tendencies in the socially engaged art of the thirties.”²⁴ In today’s design said forms serve in the domain of political advertizing. Designer who draws on them, however, does not make a poster as a framework (place, screen, surface) of the critique of the class order, or as the mirror of a historical transformation. Designer’s aim is to underline as progressive or appropriate the ideas of some party or a party alliance. For these purposes designer simulates anachronistic and totalitarian modes of expression proper to the socialist realism and art of the PLW. We can say that no ideological directive is taken over (*from the '40s*), but only the ways of representation: typical colors, compositional clichés, typographic procedures and the like. The iconography of the socialist realism is fragmented into national symbolic variables, with the drops of fashion and religious folklore.

3) Today's modes of fashioning graphic and industrial design (where it is present) show that the design in the transition – perhaps even more than some former, self-management design – is contextually determined by the category of “the ideology of the moderate modernism.“ “The moderate postwar modernism“²⁵ is the terminological determination of the large part of pictural, sculptural and graphic production in Yugoslavia from '60s and '70s. According to Jerko Denegri: “What we have here is a sort of art which attunes to its environment, which accepts, bears, and accommodates to it even when (and if) it does not imitate it overtly and explicitly.”²⁶ In the atmosphere of political conflict between two blocs, the moderate modernism was expected to offer a vision of a *socialism with the human face*. There lays the reason why the idea of “the limited and controlled pluralism“ was so dominant in the realm of the cultural politics.

In opposition to the evolution of the socialist realism into the moderate modernism some radical tendencies appeared, such as Informel or the activity of the EXAT 51 group. Nonetheless, “the first line“ of the Yugoslav art was reserved for those *neither-abstract-nor-figurative* or *both-*

²³ Slavoj Žižek, *Sublimni objekt ideologije*, Zagreb, Sarajevo, Arkzin & Društvo za teorijsku psihoanalizu, 2002, p. 86.

²⁴ Lidija Merenik, *Ideološki modeli: srpsko slikarstvo 1945–1968*, Belgrade, Beopolis-Remont, 2001, p. 21.

²⁵ The notion “socialist aestheticism“ is used with same or related connotations.

²⁶ Ješa Denegri, *Pedesete: teme srpske umetnosti*, Novi Sad, Svetovi, 1993, p. 14.

abstract-and-figurative, obviously within a-political representation of the modern art from the second or who knows what hand.²⁷ The moderate modernism was in fact “the figure of modernism“ which was accepted by authorities and included into their “strategic interests.“ Within this context (certain reservations included) the following is a worthwhile observation: “Yugoslav postwar modernism didn’t in fact sharpen its ideological discourse to the limits of the risk, or to the limits of the various modes of avant-guardistic behavior, revolt, protest, critique or radicalization of the artistic language.“²⁸ The ideology (of non-confrontation) proper to the moderate modernism nowadays is still the basis of the artistic and designer practices. In the design (and outside of it) its hallmarks are a moderation in thought and action, a joy of redundance, an absence of questioning (regarding measure, norm, quality). This is why the design is not the place of subversion, but a sublime object which fills the gap in the symbolic, that is, it heals the trauma (individual and social).

4) The forms which, within the national, testify about the power or the presence of the global are adopted in purpose of designating the narratives and doxas of the design in the transition. Let us give several examples. It is the design of the catalogue with reproductions of artists’ works in which the attention is paid to the people in transition, and in which, therefore, class differences, increasing rate of unemployment, rise of the criminal, economic, cultural and spiritual impoverishment, the lack of the political imagination and social solidarity, indifference, apathy and insecurity (as Dejan Kršić lined this things up). But, by all means, it is also the *design and layout* of a costly book on the topics from politics and art, having on its covers, most often on the inside, the logo of the Fund for an Open Society. It is also the design of all publications which, in front of the eager eyes of the West, “the ethnological-anthropological-sociological material,” which clearly shows that the countries undergoing transition are far from normality, so they should be normalized. Stemming *from the transition*, it’s a design that follows today’s artists, when they are heading somewhere. Let’s listen to Kršić for a moment: “While in their countries contemporary artists from the East represent Western culture (cosmopolitan, denationalized, globalizing, normalizing...), on the West they represent the condition of the respective states.”²⁹ It is a design loyal to the best projects, selected thus to follow the educational programs, discussions and workshops, different as to their content and pattern, but aiming to reconcile,

²⁷ Miško Šuvaković, *Martek: fatalne figure umjetnika*, Zagreb, Meandar, 2002, p. 17. On the phenomenon of moderate modernism see Ješa Denegri, „Socijalistički modernizam“, *Treći program*, 133–134, I–II, Belgrade, Radio-televizija Srbije & Filip Višnjić, 2007.

²⁸ Lidija Merenić, *Ideološki modeli: srpsko slikarstvo 1945–1968*, Belgrade, Beopolis-Remont, 2001, p. 68.

²⁹ Dejan Kršić, „In schluchten des kassel, a review“, *Up&underground/Art dossier*, 7/8, Zagreb, Bijeli val, 2004, p. 86.

cure or normalize at least someone. It's a design which fuses with that "*similar new art*," created simultaneously in non-similar cultures. A design extremely correct and pleasing, politically and in other ways, in striving to leave a mark in the aftermath of the transformation of the shattered cultures of European East into one multiculturalism of the West (without East). It is a design conformed to that extremely "*soft and subtle* uniformisation and standardization of Postmodernist pluralism and multiculturalism as a criterion of enlightened political Liberalism that has to be realized by European societies at the turn of the century."³⁰ It reflects, as it were, the politics that equalizes things and levels them up, with as less conflicts as possible or without any. In short, it is the design of advertisement in which a set of politically correct notions is given.

³⁰ Miško Šuvaković, "The Ideology of Exhibition: On the Ideologies of Manifesta", in *Platforma SCCA*, 3, Ljubljana, 2002.