

PRAKSOM PROTIV RADA

Eskalacija sukoba u Varšavskoj ulici u Zagrebu sredinom srpnja ove godine prisjetila je javnost na 1996. godinu i čuvene demonstracije protiv ukidanja emitiranja programa Radija 101, koje su se vrlo čvrsto urezale u kolektivno pamćenje građana. Iako su demonstracije u Varšavskoj po brojnosti sudionika daleko manje, činjenica je da su ta dva događaja simbolički obilježila borbu u dva različita desetljeća. U devedesetima to je bila borba za javni medijski prostor i pravo na izražavanje, dok je u ovom desetljeću prisutna borba za javni fizički prostor i pravo na grad. Očito je da se borba za demokratizaciju i slobodu teritorijalizirala u posljednjih desetak godina, a razlog tome je što je društvo prešlo iz vladavine nacionalnih autokrata u vladavinu neoliberalne oligarhije, čija je osnovna ekonomija špekuliranje zemljištem i nekretninama. U toj promjeni je i struka koja se bavi prostorom, arhitektura i urbanizam, poprimila sasvim drugačije značenje i centralniju poziciju u samom sukobu te se od nje sve radikalnije zahtijeva da se opredijeli na čijoj je strani – oligarhije ili građana.

Pravo na subjektivnost

Ovo pitanje može se učiniti neobičnim arhitektima i urbanistima naviknutima na izražavanje vlastitog stava u obrani neutralnosti i objektivnosti profesije. Ova su dva

RASPRAVA NA MEDUNARODNOJ
KONFERENCIJI "GRAD
POSTKAPITALIZMA" U ORGANIZACIJI
PULSKE GRUPE, PULA, 2009.,
FOTOGRAFIJA D. ŠTIFANIĆ

DISCUSSION HELD AT THE
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
"POST-CAPITALIST CITY"
ORGANIZED BY PULSKA GRUPA,
PULA, 2009, PHOTO BY D. ŠTIFANIĆ

EMIL

JURCAN

EMIL

JURCAN

WITH PRACTICE AGAINST WORK

The escalation of conflict in Varšavska Street (Zagreb) in mid-July this year reminded the Croatian public of 1996 and the famous protests against shutting down Radio 101, which have remained deeply incised in the collective civic memory. Although the demonstrations in Varšavska were far smaller regarding the number of participants, the fact remains that these two events have symbolically defined civic struggle in two different decades. Whereas in the 1990s it was the struggle for public space of the media and the freedom of expression, in this decade it is the struggle for physical public space and the right to the city. It is obvious that this struggle for democratization and freedom has become territorialized in the past ten years, the reason for that being the fact that the society has undergone a transition from the rule of national autocrats to the rule of neoliberal oligarchy, whose basic economy consists in speculating with land and real estate. That transition has included the profession that deals with space – that of architecture and urban planning – which has acquired an entirely different significance and a more central position in the conflict, so that it is now increasingly often compelled to take sides – for the oligarchy or for the citizens?



FRAKSOM
PROTIV RADA

WITH
PRACTICE
AGAINST
WORK

pojma možda i posljednji relikti modernizma koji su preživjeli opću kritiku pokreta od sedamdesetih do danas. Međutim, pridržavanje neutralnosti kao jedinog i izoliranog epiteta modernizma, koji ne prate znanstvene metode rada, socijalni angažman i država blagostanja, nemoguća je misija, a ustrajanje na toj obrani donosi sve veću štetu kako ugledu i autoritetu struke tako i njenom kredibilitetu te se gotovo svaki pokušaj dokazivanja neutralnosti izjalovi u sumnju javnosti u korumpiranost samih arhitekata i urbanista. Marta Malo de Molina, španjolska teoretičarka i aktivistica, opisuje kritiku tradicionalne modernističke pozicije neutralnog istraživanja i umjesto njega uvodi tzv. militantno istraživanje, odnosno istraživanje koje se bazira na kritici trenutnih struktura moći te na kolektivnoj praksi koja vrednuje marginalna znanja proizašla iz grupnog otpora, građanskog neposluha i osobnog iskustva represije koju sadašnja politička struktura provodi.¹

Ovakva teoretska pozicija izuzetno je bitna u raspravi o urbanizmu u kojem je jasno da svaka odluka proizvodi sukobe među antagonističkim interesima građana; u prvom redu to su interesi špekulanata koji su suprotstavljeni interesima mnoštva. Ako se taj antagonizam ne negira, nego se prihvati, moguće je predložiti drugačije iščitavanje djelovanja struke – iščitavanje koje se bazira na otkrivanju vlastitih subjektivnih

pozicija te na prepoznavanju žive povijesti marginalnih kolektivnih otpora koje arhitekti i urbanisti svakodnevno provode.

Odbijanje rada

Politiziranim iščitavanjem rada on prestaje biti samo izvršavanje zadataka i poprima oblik izražavanja stava. Stoga je moguće pitanje: postoji li i skriveni, nevidljivi otpor koji arhitekti i urbanisti prakticiraju, a za angažman kojega javnost nije uopće svjesna?

Sigurno je broj stručnjaka koji su nezadovoljni sadašnjom društvenom situacijom daleko veći od broja osoba koje to javno izriču. Dakle, moguće je da postoji nezanemariv broj arhitekata i urbanista koji svoje nezadovoljstvo sustavom ispoljavaju tiho i neprimjetno. Kada se govori o strahovitoj tromosti procesa prostornog uređenja i gradnje u Hrvatskoj, rasprava se svede na kritiku apstraktnih kategorija poput „inertnosti sustava“, „nesređenog katastra“, „kompliciranosti procedura“, „čestih izmjena zakona“ itd. No cijeli taj sustav čini izuzetno velik broj naših kolega u raznim sferama. Zašto bi njihova subjektivna uloga, taj ljudski faktor, bila zanemarena u proučavanju nefunkcionalnosti sustava? Činjenica je da stručnjaci u urbanizmu imaju vlastite političke stavove i ne pristupaju svojem poslu neutralno. Također je

Right to Subjectivity

This question might seem unusual to architects and urban planners, used as they are to expressing their position by defending the neutrality and objectivity of their profession. These two terms may be the last relics of modernism, having survived the overall critique of the movement from the 1970s until the present day. However, remaining neutral as the unique and isolated attribute of modernism, without any backing of scholarly working methods, social engagement, or welfare state, is an impossible mission, while insisting on it causes severe damage both to the reputation and authority of the profession and to its credibility. In fact, each attempt at proving its neutrality ends in public suspicion that the architects and urban planners might be corrupted themselves. Spanish theoretician and activist Marta Malo de Molina has offered a critique of the traditional modernist position of neutral research and introduced the notion of the so-called militant research, i.e. research based on the critique of the prevailing power structures and on collective practice that values marginal insights gathered from group resistance, civic disobedience, and personal experience of repression exerted by dominant political structures.¹

This theoretical position is exceptionally important in a debate on urban planning in which it is clear that each decision

causes conflicts among the antagonized interests, primarily those of speculators versus general population. If we choose to accept this antagonism instead of negating it, it is possible to propose a different interpretation of the profession's behaviour – an interpretation based on discovering one's own subjective position and acknowledging the living history of marginal collective resistances, carried out by architects and urban planners on a daily basis.

Refusal of Work

When we interpret work in a politicized manner, it ceases to be mere fulfillment of various tasks and becomes a way of expressing one's attitude. It is therefore possible to ask the following question: is there a clandestine, invisible form of resistance practiced by architects and urban planners, resistance that the public is completely unaware of?

The number of experts that are dissatisfied with the present social situation must be far greater than the number of people publicly expressing it. Thus, there may be a considerable number of architects and urban planners who express their dissatisfaction with the system quietly and imperceptibly. When there is a debate on the terrible slowness of urban planning and construction in Croatia, it mostly comes down to a critique of abstract categories such as "inertness of

činjenica da je hijerarhija odlučivanja u društvu postavljena na način da ti isti ljudi nemaju nikakve mogućnosti mijenjanja političkih odluka djelujući iz svoje stručne pozicije. Stoga je logična opcija djelovanja unutar takvog sustava upravo odbijanje rada, koji se ne tretira kao stručni rad, koji podrazumijeva i moć odlučivanja, već jednostavno kao puka radna snaga odnosno kao živi kapital. Takvo odbijanje rada sigurno nije zanemarivo u sagledavanju svih kočnica koje blokiraju proces prostornog planiranja, a koji u trenutnim političkim okvirima neminovno proizvodi prostornu nepravdu, što mnogi stručnjaci itekako dobro znaju. Da li je moguće pretpostaviti da određeni broj tih stručnjaka u Hrvatskoj odbija efikasno raditi za sustav u koji uopće ne vjeruju? Mario Tronti, marksistički filozof, napisao je 1965. godine vrlo utjecajan esej pod nazivom „Strategija odbijanja“ koji je opisivao borbu talijanskih radnika protiv kapitalizma „iz unutra“ odnosno putem sabotáže.² Nisku produktivnost radnika, koja se do tada karakterizirala kao „lijenost Talijana“, Tronti je opisao kao strategiju odbijanja rada za sustav u kojemu ne postoji mogućnost mijenjanja istoga. Da bi se borili protiv kapitala, radnici se moraju boriti protiv sebe, jednom kada su svedeni na živi kapital, te je stoga borba protiv rada zapravo odbijanje radne snage da se svede na puki rad bez političkog odlučivanja. Opisivanjem strategije

odbijanja rada zaključio je da je ona prvi korak prema obnavljanju vlastite autonomije koju proizvodni proces kapitala neprestano ugrožava. Ta teorija bila je izuzetno aktualna u Italiji sedamdesetih, a arhitekt Pier Vittorio Aureli primjenjuje je u svojoj knjizi „The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture Within and against Capitalism“ za opisivanje angažmana arhitekata tog doba, poput Alda Rossia i grupe Arhizoom.³

Može li se današnja situacija među urbanistima usporediti s onom talijanskih radnika u doba Maria Trontia? Ako je to moguće i ako je u procesu planiranja već zastupljena strategija odbijanja rada, može se zaključiti da je struka već sada izuzetno politizirano i angažirano tijelo te da osnove za, Aurelijevim riječima, „projekt autonomije“ u gradu već postoje.

Nezaposlenost – nužna potreba za organizacijom

Možda se najpoznatiji primjer strategije odbijanja u Hrvatskoj dogodio krajem 2007. godine kada je devet urbanista zaposlenih u zagrebačkom Zavodu za planiranje odbilo potpisati završnu verziju Generalnog urbanističkog plana. Nakon višemjesečnih pritisaka i prijetnji gubitkom posla te degradacijom ipak su popustili, a u medijima je tada pisalo: „Naime, većina tih ljudi je pred mirovinom i jednostavno nisu mogli toliko riskirati –ispričao nam je djelatnik tog Zavoda,

the system,” “chaotic cadastre,” “complicated procedures,” “frequent changes of laws,” etc. However, the system actually includes a large number of our colleagues in various domains. Why should their subjective role, that human factor, remain neglected in our study of the system’s lack of functionality? It is a fact that experts in urban planning have their own political agendas and that they are far from impartial in their actions. Another fact is that the hierarchy of decision making in the society is organized in such a way that precisely these persons have no possibility of changing the political decisions from their professional perspective. Therefore, it is a logical option to act within the system precisely by refusing to work, since it is not treated as professional work that would include power to make decisions, but simply as human labour or living capital. Such refusal of work is certainly far from negligible when it comes to considering all those obstacles that block the process of spatial planning, which in the current political constellation, as many experts undoubtedly know, inevitably generates spatial injustice. Can it be presumed that a certain number of these experts in Croatia refuses to work efficiently because they absolutely do not believe in the system?

In 1965, Marxist philosopher Mario Tronti wrote a very influential essay entitled “The Strategy of Refusal”, in which he

described the struggle of Italian workers against capitalism “from within”, struggle in the form of sabotage.² Their low productivity, which had been hitherto characterized as “Italian laziness,” was now described as a strategy of refusal to work for a system that did not allow for a possibility of change. In order to fight capital, workers actually had to fight themselves, since they had been reduced to living capital. This means that their struggle against work was actually the refusal of human labour force to let itself be reduced to mere work, without any political decision making. When describing the strategy of refusal to work, Tronti concluded that it was the first step towards recovering one’s autonomy, permanently threatened by the process of capitalist production. This theory was exceptionally popular in Italy in the 1970s, and architect Pier Vittorio Aureli applied it in his book on “The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture within and against Capitalism” when describing the engagement of architects of that time, such as Aldo Rossi and the Arhizoom group.³ Is today’s situation among the urban planners comparable with that of the Italian workers in Mario Tronti’s time? If it is, and if the process of urban planning already contains the strategy of refusal to work, then we may conclude that the profession has evolved into an exceptionally politicized and engaged body, so that, according to Aurelio’s words, there

koji je zbog straha od gubitka posla želio ostati anoniman".⁴ Devet urbanista bilo je samo u ovoj borbi, a očito je bilo da niti jedna postojeća organizacija arhitekata nema mogućnosti obrane svojih kolega u ovakvim situacijama.

Nedostatak organizacije koja bi bila sposobna štiti prava arhitekata primjetan je već duži niz godina. Neplaćeni prekovremeni rad, rad na određeno, ugovori na neto plaću i rad na crno pratili su arhitektonsku proizvodnju kroz prethodne godine, a posljednje je godine tim problemima pridodan i rast nezaposlenosti, posebice među tek diplomiranim arhitektima, koji su gotovo u pravilu imali ugovore na određeno. Trenutno je na Zavodu za zapošljavanje prijavljeno preko 160 arhitekata, od kojih je 60 s manje od 3 godine radnog iskustva.

Svi ti pokazatelji govore da je najnužniji korak trenutno u struci taktičko organiziranje i udruživanje s pokretima nezadovoljnih, kojih trenutno u gradovima ima sve više. Jose Peres de Lama, sevillski arhitekt i član kolektiva Hackitectura.net, povlači paralelu između današnje situacije i one s početka 20. stoljeća kada je nastao modernistički pokret i CIAM. Tada je naime došlo do udruživanja društvenih aktivista, sindikata, političkih stranaka te avangardnih umjetnika i tehničara, koji su dijelili zajedničku želju za promjenom neizdržljivih životnih uvjeta. Arhitekti i umjetnici

tada su poduzeli ključan korak naprijed i postali politički aktivne osobe, koje su u suradnji sa sindikatima i političkim strankama razvile ideju modernističkog grada. Prema prof. de Lami ključna je činjenica da je modernizam nastao kao politički pokret, a njegovo odvajanje od političkih ideala rezultiralo je tehnokratizacijom, koja je i jedan od temelja današnjih problema u urbanizmu i razlog učestalih sukoba u gradu.⁵ Potrebno je stoga uspostaviti nove političke alijanse među umjetnicima, tehničarima, znanstvenicima i aktivistima. Međutim očito je da danas ne možemo ponoviti istu formulu kao modernisti i tražiti suradnju s političkim strankama i sindikatima, čija se uloga u društvu od tada u potpunosti izmijenila. Potrebno je istražiti koji su društveni subjekti danas sposobni razviti suradnju koja bi proizvela modele za pravedniji gradski prostor. De Lama smatra da „naši saveznici mogu biti nezavisni politički i društveni pokreti ili neformalne inicijative jer se upravo u tim mrežama razvijaju novi politički subjekti koji su sposobni mijenjati društvenu stvarnost.“⁶

Zajedničko slobodno vrijeme

Neki od preduvjeta za povezivanje arhitekata u mrežu novih političkih subjekata već su opisani u prethodnim podnaslovima, poput prihvaćanja vlastite ne-neutralnosti i strategije odbijanja rada, koji je shvaćen isključivo kao živi

are some pre-existing foundations for an "autonomy project" in the city.

Unemployment – Urgent Need for Organization

Perhaps the most famous Croatian example of the refusal strategy occurred late in 2007, when nine urban planners employed at the Institute for Physical Planning in Zagreb refused to sign the final version of Master Plan. After several months of pressure and threats of employment loss and degradation, they finally gave in, and the mass media reported on the case in the following way: "Namely, most of these people are near retirement and they simply could not take such a risk – as we were told by one of the employees at the Institute, who preferred to stay anonymous, fearing that he would lose his job."⁴ There were only nine urban planners in this struggle and it became obvious that no existing organization of architects had the possibility of defending their colleagues in such situations.

The lack of an organization that would be capable of protecting the rights of architects has been evident for many years. Unpaid extra-hours, limited time contracts, net payment contracts, and illegal work have constantly accompanied architectural production throughout the past years. Last year, these problems were aggravated through the

increased unemployment rate, especially among the recently graduated architects, who almost regularly obtain contracts only for a limited period of time. Currently there are more than 160 architects registered with the unemployment office, among whom more than 60 have less than 3 years of working experience.

All these facts indicate that the most urgent step for the profession is currently that of strategically organizing it, in association with the civic movements of dissatisfaction, whose number is growing in the urban areas. Jose Peres de Lama, a Sevilla-based architect and member of the Hackitectura.net collective, has drawn a parallel between the present situation and that of the early 20th century, which generated the modernist movement and CIAM. At that time, social activists, trade unions, and political parties joined forces with avant-garde artists and technicians, sharing the same desire to alter the insufferable living conditions. Architects and artists then took a decisive step forward and became politically active persons, developing the idea of the modernist city in cooperation with trade unions and political parties. According to Prof. de Lama, the key fact is that modernism once emerged as a political movement and that its separation from these political ideals resulted in technocratization, which has remained one of the key

kapital bez političke moći odlučivanja. Treći preduvjet za društveno povezivanje jest posjedovanje nečega što talijanski filozof Paolo Virno naziva „kolektivan intelektualni rad“ – društvenim znanjem koje u informatiziranom radu postaje osnovna proizvodna snaga, ali istovremeno i osnova za razvoj direktne demokracije i ne-državne javne sfere.⁷ Rad arhitekata kao i svih ostalih kognitivnih radnika u svojoj je osnovi razvio visok stupanj socijalizacije i razmjene iskustva, informacija i znanja, a ta razmjena, osim što postaje nužna za razvoj profesije, paralelno gradi nove forme solidarnosti i kolektivnog djelovanja.

Osobno sam sudjelovao u eksperimentu jednog kolektivnog intelektualnog rada, koji djeluje već gotovo dvije godine. Riječ je o *mailing* listi „muzil-arh“, koja okuplja 20 arhitekata, a koja je formirana s ciljem „stvaranja pravednog plana korištenja bivšeg vojnog područja Muzil u Puli“.⁸ Iako nemaju istu stručnu spremu, ne rade zajedno na poslu, ne rade slične poslove i ne žive u istom gradu,⁹ sudionici ove *mailing* liste svakodnevnom su komunikacijom putem e-maila uspjeli organizirati procese poput dvotjednog mjerenja poluotoka Muzil, čiji su rezultati sažeti u „Muzil elaboratu“ na 80-ak stranica nacrtu, koji je ustupljen studentima Arhitektonskog fakulteta u Zagrebu i Madridu za potrebe nastavnog procesa. Također, organizirali su trodnevni međunarodni simpozij

„Grad postkapitalizma“, koji je održan u Puli u kolovozu 2009. godine i koji je rezultirao i istoimenim zbornikom simpozija. Svaki pojedinac s liste angažirao se na proizvodnji spomenutih nacrtu i publikacija, odnosno teorije u svoje slobodno vrijeme. „Muzil-arh“ *mailing* lista nije navedena kao iznimka ili paradigma u ovoj priči, s obzirom na postojanje iznimno velikog broja takvih lista u svijetu, uza sve ostale društvene mreže koje su trenutno na raspolaganju. Primjer je uzet kao moje osobno iskustvo koje poznajem bolje i koje mogu opisati „iz prve ruke“. Međutim, i taj primjer dovoljan je da slikovito opiše postojanje zajedničkog intelekta i potencijal tog intelekta koji je sposoban u nekoliko godina angažmana u slobodnom vremenu proizvesti vrlo opipljive produkte poput elaborata ili zbornika.

Umrežene prakse

Drugo iskustvo koje je vidljivo u djelovanju „muzil-arh“ liste nemogućnost je definiranja vremena koje se investiralo u samu proizvodnju. To vrijeme se kolokvijalno naziva „slobodnim“ jer se u tom trenutku doista proizvodilo slobodno, no ti su se trenutci slobode pojavljivali kako u vremenu koje je otuđeno ugovorom o radu tako i u vremenu nakon redovitog posla. Dakle, proizvodno vrijeme razvijalo se neovisno o radnom vremenu, često i u međusobnom sukobu.

FRAKSOM
PROTIV RADA

WITH
PRACTICE
AGAINST
WORK

problems in urban planning and a cause of many conflicts in the city.⁵ Therefore, it is necessary to create new political alliances between artists, technicians, scientists, and activists. However, it is obvious that today we cannot use the same formula as the modernists or seek cooperation with political parties and trade unions, since their role in the society has completely changed. It is necessary to explore which social agents are now capable of entering into a sort of cooperation that would generate models for a fairer urban space. De Lama is of the opinion that “our allies might be independent and social movements or informal initiatives, since it is precisely in such networks that new political subjects have evolved, capable of changing the social reality.”

Common Spare Time

Some of the preconditions for connecting architects into this network of new political subjects have already been described in the previous sections, including the acknowledgment of one’s non-neutrality and strategy of refusing work that is understood as living capital with no power of political decision making. The third precondition for social association is having something that Italian philosopher Paolo Virno has termed “common intellect” – social knowledge that becomes the basic production force

in informatized work, as well as a basis for developing direct democracy and non-state public sphere.⁷ Work of architects, as well as all other cognitive workers, has basically developed a high degree of socialization and exchange of experience, information, and knowledge, and that exchange, besides becoming necessary for the development of the profession, builds new forms of solidarity and collective action. I have personally participated in one such experiment with common intellect, which has now been going on for almost two years. It is the “muzil-arh” mailing list, established with the aim of “creating a fair project for using the former military area of Muzil in Pula,” which today connects some twenty architects.⁸ Even though they have different levels of education and different working places, perform different jobs and even live in different cities,⁹ members of this mailing list have been in everyday contact and managed through e-mail to organize events such as the two-week measuring of the Muzil peninsula, the results of which were presented in an 80-page “Muzil Elaborate”, sent to the students at the faculties of architecture in Zagreb and Madrid for educational purposes. In August 2009, they organized a three-day international symposium on “The Post-Capitalist City” in Pula, the proceedings of which were published the following year. Each member of the list was involved in the making of these

Upravo je sukob tih dvaju vremena jedna od glavnih karakteristika kreativne proizvodnje u koju spada i arhitektura – brisanje granice između radnog i proizvodnog vremena. Kreativni se proces provodi kroz čitavo vrijeme: na radnom mjestu, kod kuće, u razgovoru s kolegama i socijalizaciji te na taj način proizvodno vrijeme nije više samo radno vrijeme nego društveno vrijeme u svojoj cjelini.

U takvim uvjetima ništa ne razlikuje rad od ostalih ljudskih djelatnosti – čitavo društveno vrijeme pretvara se u aktivnost odnosno praksu – pojam koji Gajo Petrović definira kao slobodnu i stvaralačku djelatnost novoga suprotnu radu shvaćenom jednostavno kao reprodukcija staroga. Jednom kada se projekt prihvaćanja prakse (kao aktivnosti stvaranja novoga) i odbijanjem rada (kao aktivnosti reprodukcije staroga) razvije do zajedničkog nivoa, on ima potencijal razvijanja „kolektivnog stvaralačkog procesa“, koji Petrović jednostavno naziva revolucijom „u kojoj ljudi, mijenjajući društvene odnose, mijenjaju i vlastitu prirodu“.¹⁰ Nije li put umreženih aktivnosti mimo posla upravo taj put prema „kolektivnoj praksi“ oslobođenoj od rada?

Put kojim arhitektura danas može krenuti ako želi izmijeniti ne samo sebe nego i uvjete u kojima nastaje, podrazumijeva preduvjete na koje apelira ovaj članak: taktike organiziranja na nivou društva, a ne struke, strategija odbijanja rada shvaćenog isključivo kao živi kapital te umrežena stvaralačka

praksa mimo (redovnog) posla.

¹ Vidi: Marta Malo de Molina (ur.), *Nociones comunes. Experiencias y ensayos entre investigación y militancia*, Traficantes de Sueños, Madrid, 2004.

² Mario Tronti, *Operai e Capitale*, Einaudi Torino, Torino, 1971., 234–252.

³ Vidi: Vittorio Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture Within and against Capitalism*, Princeton Architectural Press, New York, 2008.

⁴ Ante Milković, Boba Blašković, „Bandićevi urbanisti odbili potpisati GUP“, *Jutarnji list*, 6. 2. 2008.

⁵ Hackitectura.net, „Pobunjeni kiborzi šecu metropolama“, u: *Grad postkapitalizma*, Centar za anarhističke studije, Zagreb, 2010., 199–213.

⁶ Isto.

⁷ Vidi: Paolo Virno, *Gramatika mnoštva – prilog analizi suvremenih formi života*, Jesenski i Turk, Zagreb, 2004.

⁸ Za više informacija vidi: <http://www.muzil.org>.

⁹ Sudionici mailing liste „muzil-arh“ djeluju u Zagrebu, Rijeci, Puli, Splitu, Ljubljani, Trstu i Barceloni. Njih petnaest je diplomiralo arhitekturu, jedna osoba likovnu akademiju, a četiri još uvijek studiraju arhitekturu. U protekle dvije godine sedam osoba je imalo iskustva s gubitkom ili promjenom posla, dok je osam osoba kontinuirano zaposleno na istom radnom mjestu. Trenutno su tri osobe zaposlene u javnim ustanovama, dok ostali rade u privatnim.

¹⁰ Gajo Petrović, *Filozofija i revolucija*, Naprijed, Zagreb, 1983., 80.

projects and publications, as well as engaged in theoretical reflection in his or her spare time. I have not included “Muzil-arh” in this story as an exception or a paradigm, since there are very many such lists in the world, not mentioning other social networks that now stand at our disposal. I have rather taken it as an example that I know well and can describe it from “firsthand experience.” However, this one example may suffice to illustrate the existence of a common intellect and the potential of that intellect for producing, during a few years of engagement in one’s spare time, some very tangible results such as an elaborate or a book of proceedings.

Networked Practices

Another element that is evident in the activity of “muzil-arh” is the impossibility of defining how much time has been invested in production as such. In colloquial speech, this time is usually called “spare” or “free”, and in those moments the production was indeed free, but such moments of freedom appeared either during the time alienated from the working contract, or during the time after the working hours. Thus, the production time was evolving independently of the working hours, often even in conflict with them.

It is precisely the conflict between these two times that has been a major feature of creative production that includes

architecture – the blurred borderlines between working time and production time. The creative process is taking place all the while: at the working place, at home, in conversation with colleagues, in one’s social life; therefore, production time is no longer equivalent to working time, it is social time in its entirety.

In such circumstances, work is in no way different from other human activities, where the entire social time becomes activity or practice – the term that Gajo Petrović has defined as free and creative activity, creation of something new, as opposed to work that is understood merely as reproduction of the old. Once the project of acknowledging practice (as the activity of creating something new) and refusing work (as the activity of reproducing the old) has evolved to the common level, it will have the potential for developing a “collective creative process,” which Petrović has simply identified as a revolution “in which people, by changing the social relations, change their own nature.”¹⁰ Isn’t the path of networked activities outside work actually that very path towards a “collective practice” that is freed from work?

The path that architecture should take today if it wants to change not only itself, but also the circumstances in which it is embedded, implies the preconditions that I have referred to in this article: strategies of organization on the level of

the society rather than profession, refusal of work that is understood merely as living capital, and networked creative practice outside of (regular) work.

¹ Cf. Marta Malo de Molina (ed.), *Nociones comunes. Experiencias y ensayos entre investigación y militancia* (Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños, 2004).

² Mario Tronti, *Operai e Capitale* (Turin: Einaudi Torino, 1971), pp. 234-252.

³ Cf. Vittorio Aureli, *The Project of Autonomy: Politics and Architecture within and against Capitalism* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2008).

⁴ Ante Milković and Boba Blašković, "Bandićevi urbanisti odbili potpisati GUP" [Bandić's urban planners refused to sign the Master Plan], *Jutarnji list*, 6 February 2008.

⁵ Hackitectura.net, "Pobunjeni kiborzi šeću metropolama" [Rebellious cyborgs walk the cities], in: *Grad postkapitalizma* [The post-capitalist city] (Zagreb: Centre for Anarchist Studies, 2010), pp. 199-213.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Cf. Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude*, transl. by Isabella Bertoletti, James Cascaito, and Andrea Casson (Los Angeles and New York: Semiotext(e), 2004).

⁸ For additional information see: <http://www.muzil.org>.

⁹ Members of the "muzil-arh" mailing list live in Zagreb, Rijeka, Pula, Split, Ljubljana, Trieste, and Barcelona. Fifteen of them have graduated architecture, one visual arts, and four are still students of architecture. In the past two years, seven persons have lost their jobs or had to change working places, while eight of them is permanently employed. Currently, three of them are employed by public institutions and the rest by private employers.

¹⁰ Gajo Petrović, *Filozofija i revolucija* [Philosophy and revolution] (Zagreb: Naprijed, 1983), p. 80.