

Commentary (3.1.4.)

69scenes (3.1.4.1.)

Violence versus Militant (3.1.4.2.)

Active Time versus Dead Time (3.1.4.3.)

In Love? Part One (3.1.4.4.)

Get Rid of Yourself (3.1.4.5.)

In Love? Part Two (3.1.4.6.)

The Youth House versus The Father House (3.1.4.7.)

69scenes (3.1.4.1.)

The story of The Youth House at Jagtvej 69 is long and strange. The dramatic circumstances surrounding the demolition of the house at Jagtvej 69 was the subject of my exhibition '69scenes' at Bendixen Contemporary Art in September 2008. '69scenes' was one of the first projects done in the framework of this phd-research. What follows here is a selection of the 69 small texts that was connected to the 69 art-work comprising the exhibition. The selection is here intended to give a kind of short summary of the extremely labyrinthine narratives that make up the history of The Youth House. My references for this timeline are a maze of texts found on the internet: Newspaper articles, activist manifestos, political comments, blog-entries etc. All in Danish. Many of these are not available on the internet anymore. I have made an appendix, Appendix69 consisting of pdf-copies of all the relevant texts from this material. After each timeline entry, there is a reference to the relevant documents in this appendix.

1982: Jagtvej 69

The Youth House was given by Egon Weidekamp, the then mayor of Copenhagen, to a group of squatters, the so-called BZ, back in 1982. After a long series of violent fights and general trouble with the very active BZ-movement, the city of Copenhagen wanted to calm the situation down by giving the BZ a house to develop their special branch of punk-culture in. The strategy didn't really work, and trouble, squatting and street-fighting continued. The house was there to stay though, and all through the 1980s and 1990s it became a central platform for the alternative punk and activism culture in Copenhagen. The house itself had a long and glorious past: It was built in 1897 as the community centre of The Workers Movement. In 1910 it accomodated the Second International Women's Conference, and throughout the 20th Century, it was an important political address in Copenhagen. As The Youth House, it became especially important as a non-commercial concert venue. A impressive range of great musicians have played concerts there; Nick Cave & The Birthday Party, Bjørk among others. (Appendix69: a)

Autumn 1999

After a series of quarrels with the activists about a fire and the necessary restoration of The Youth House, the city of Copenhagen decided to sell Jagtvej 69. The activists using the house would thereby be evicted. They, on their side, reacted by hanging a highly satirical banner on the facade of the house:

"FOR SALE INCLUDING 500 VIOLENT PSYCOPATHS FROM HELL".

The raw self-irony of this sentence became a crucial factor in the further development of the sale. (Appendix69: b)

November 16, 2000: Human A/S

After rejecting a couple of buyers as 'unserious', the City of Copenhagen sells Jagtvej 69 in November 2000. The buyer is the newly established foundation Human A/S that buys the house for 2.6 million Danish kroner. Human A/S is led by the relatively unknown lawyer, Inger Loft, and some other anonymous persons. To Ritzau Newsagency Inger Loft states:

"The plan is to continue Jagtvej 69 as a youth house, but it not yet specified how. It has to be discussed with the various partners in the process".

The users of The Youth House are not especially optimistic about this dialogue, though. When Inger Loft arrives at Jagtvej 69, she is greeted by a bucket of water in her face.

"She claims she wants influence. The little lady doesn't understand that the only way to get influence in The Youth House is by participating in the collective meetings. We don't speak the same language, and she seems incredibly naive",

a spokesman for the users states. (Appendix69: c1, c2)

September 2001: The Fatherhouse

A clause in the contract of the sale states that The Youth House cannot be sold again, without offering it first to the City of Copenhagen. This clause, though, doesn't prevent the buyer, Human A/S, from selling out. Which is exactly what happens, when the fundamentalist Christian church, The Fatherhouse, buys Human A/S and thus becomes the owner of The Youth House. The Fatherhouse and The Youth House. The Fatherhouse had been trying to buy the house in the first round, but was rejected as an 'unserious buyer'. Immediately after the take-over, The Fatherhouse announces that they want to develop the house as a Christian Youth House. They terminate the agreement with the users with three months' notice. The head of The Fatherhouse, Ruth Evensen, later states that she was provoked into action by the infamous banner "FOR SALE INCLUDING 500 VIOLENT PSYCOPATHS FROM HELL". Seeing it, she immediately felt obliged to God to clean up, rinse out the evil of The Youth House. The Fatherhouse is hierarchically centered around Ruth Evensen. Apart from The Youth House, their main themes are fights against homosexuality and free abortion. But the The Youth House case is by all means Ruth Evensen's claim to fame, and she is given almost unlimited speaking time in the mainstream media. (Appendix69: a)¹

August 28, 2006: The Fortress of Trekroner

On this day the High Court reaffirms the judgement of the District Court from 2004 in the case between The Fatherhouse and The Youth House:

"The case is not to be ruled under the Rent Act. The users of The Youth House must recognize that their users' agreement has terminated and furthermore have to recognize that all other agreements concerning the use of The Youth House is terminated."

Ahead of the conclusion of the High Court The Youth House had stated that

"decisions concerning the fate of The Youth House will be taken by the Monday Meeting inside The Youth House and NOT by the High Court".

The users still reject leaving the building, proposing a political solution. After the conclusion made by the High Court, activists from The Youth House occupy the Fortress of Trekroner, an island in the harbour of Copenhagen. Dressed as pirates, they organize a press meeting at the fortress, stating their views on the judgement of

the High Court. Subsequently, the 20 activists are arrested by the Copenhagen Police. (Appendix69: a)²

September 24, 2006

268 activist are arrested in Nørrebro, Copenhagen, when a demonstration supporting The Youth House, evolves into turmoil. According to the activists, it is the behavior of the police that provokes the incident. A spokesman for the demonstration states:

“Quite unprovoked, the police choose to drive their vehicles straight into our demonstrators; obviously, people want to defend themselves in such a situation. It is complete madness, and I don’t understand what’s going on at the operational level of the police”,

According to the police, though, it was a quite different situation. As the spokesperson of the police, Flemming Steen Munch states:

“When the demonstration reached Queen Louise Bridge at 17 in the afternoon, some activist were masked, thereby breaking the law. Various objects – mostly fruit – was thrown at the police. The police estimated that the demonstration wasn’t heading for the City centre, but instead moved towards Folkets Park (The People’s Park). Here cobblestones were dug up, there were several fires and barricades were built. Stones and bottles were thrown at the police. The situation escalated and brought back memories of the infamous May 18th riots in 1993.”

(Appendix69: d1 + d2)

September 2006: The Jagtvej 69 Foundation

In September, The Jagtvej 69 Foundation is created for the purpose of buying back The Youth House from The Fatherhouse, giving it back to the users and thereby securing

“an active, dynamic and exciting environment for the youth of Copenhagen”.

The Foundation offered 5 million Danish kroner, but The Fatherhouse rejected the offer. Commenting on this, the head of the Copenhagen Police, Hanne Bech Hansen, said she hoped that The Fatherhouse would eventually sell the house, because this would prevent a confrontation. Even the mayor, Ritt Bjerregaard, recommended The Fatherhouse to sell, which led to criticism by the local right-wing politicians, claiming the mayor was giving in to “burning down the streets of Copenhagen”. A professor in public law stated that such a pressure from the mayor was controversial, but legal. The Fatherhouse pointed out that for them, the case is one of principle, and they were in no mood to give in to the attacks they had been subjected to. (Appendix69: a)

December 16, 2006: Jagtvej

This Saturday a dramatic street-fight evolves in Nørrebro. The police encircle an unannounced demonstration in favour of The Youth House, driving their armed vehicles directly into the protesters. They reply with paint-bombs, stonethrowing, clubs and fireworks. There are bonfires in several places on Nørrebrogade, and in the side streets. Several storefront windows are broken. After the encirclement, the demonstraton is scattered, but the street-fighting explodes again later in Nørrebros

Runddel. As evening falls, everything calms down, but there are still burning barricades in Nørrebrogade and several streets are blacked-out. According to information by the police, 273 are arrested, even more injured, of these, two severely. After this rampage of violence and destruction, many ordinary residents of Nørrebro deny their sympathy for The Youth House. Some supporters claim that the violence is the responsibility of the politicians, while others – among these some figures of the cultural elite – denounce the violence, but maintain their support for The Youth House. (Appendix69: e1, e2, e3)

March 1, 2007: Copenhagen

After months of tense waiting, the police evict The Youth House from Jagtvej 69 in the very early hours of March 1st. In a well-organized surprise action, the police attack the building from above with the support of two military helicopters. The maneuver is fast, effectual and fierce. The still-sleeping activists are removed immediately. Witnesses speak of massive doses of tear gas and direct fighting, while the police insist that the eviction is undramatic and relatively peaceful. (Appendix69: a + f1, f2, f8)

March 2007: Nørrebro

The eviction of The Youth House is answered by massive demonstrations, dramatic street-fighting and vandalism on an unprecedented scale. Burning cars, barricades, bonfires in the streets, a grammar school vandalized. The riots last for several days and spread to the entire city, escalating day by day. (Appendix69: a + f3, f4, f5, f6, f7, f9)

March 5, 2007: Jagtvej 69

By request of The Fatherhouse, the demolition of The Youth House starts early in the morning. Since none of the companies in charge of the demolition want to be recognized, fearing reprisals, all equipment is painted over in silver, and all company logos and signs are removed. An army of ghost machines destroying The Youth House. The demolition is guarded by the police. (Appendix69: a + g1, g2, g3, g4)

March 2007: Jagtvej 69

A few days after the demolition a group of policemen that took part in the eviction of The Youth House are spotted on the empty ground, where they stand pissing, marking the territory won in battle. Territorial pissing. The incident leads to public debate on the lack of emotional distance in the motives driving the police forces. (Appendix69: h1)

March 2007: Ground 69

Even though the riots and the street-fighting fade out, a new widespread network emerges around the loss of The Youth House. The address, Jagtvej 69, becomes increasingly mythical, and an omnipresent campaign of graffiti, stickers, badges, posters etc scatters the number 69 all over the world. Even the empty lot on Jagtvej 69 now becomes the assembly point of demonstrations, parties and other kinds of lament. In this spirit, the lot is called Ground 69, with reference to Ground Zero in New York. (Appendix69: i1 + i2)

2007/2008: 70 Thursdays in Copenhagen

Out of the lost Youth House emerges the so-called Youth House Movement; the logistic platform of the movement is the weekly Thursday demonstrations. Every week for one and a half year, demonstrations are organized, rallying for 'More Free

Spaces Now!' or 'More Operahouses Now!' or 'Feminists for Free Spaces!' The Thursday demos are organized by shifting organisations, and over time huge and creative manifestations conquer public space in various ways. (Appendix69: j)

September 9, 2007: Grey Block

The so-called Grey Block consisting of BZ-veterans from the 1980s has organized the weekly demo:

“The Thursday demo on 6.9. has the theme ‘69’ (we wonder why?). From 69 different places, a variety of groups will meet at 17h at a huge number of streets, meeting in front of number 6-9 or 69. From there we walk to Blaagaards Square, where everyone is greeted by Folk-Kitchen, music etc. At 19h we all walk in a huge demo to the City Square, where we have music and protests. If the police think this will be too chaotic, then they are probably right. But that’s the way it goes, when Copenhagen is lacking a Youth House. If the police want to block your star-demo, just walk around them or continue on the pavement (this is not illegal). It will be impossible for them to stop 69 demos at the same time. If you are scattered, then just go directly to Blaagaards Square, where we will all meet. Fuck, it’s gonna be great! Bring your friends, your cell-mates, your colleagues and grandchildren to a 69-demo, close to you!”

(Appendix69: k1, k2)

October 6, 2007: G13

In the largest manifestation of the Youth House Movement, several thousand activists attempt to occupy an empty building on Grøndalsvænge Alle 13 on the outskirts of Copenhagen. The action has been prepared for months and has been announced weeks ahead. This strategy is inspired by the large actions surrounding the G8-meeting earlier the same year in Rostock, Germany. The action is named G13, and both activists and police are extremely well-prepared. The action evolves violently, but this time with the police as aggressors. In a controlled operation, it is the activists that show restraint and refrain from violence. At the end of the day, several hundred G13-activists occupy the well-guarded house for a couple of hours, raising the pirate flag on the rooftop. (Appendix69: L)

G13 is the topic of the performance ‘G13greenredturquoiseyellow’ (Aor 3.2)

October 2007: City Hall

In the days following G13, even the chief police officer of the police operation, Per Larsen, announces his respect for the” disciplined non-violence of the protestors” and calls out for a political solution to the Youth House problem, urging the mayor of Copenhagen to start negotiations. And the mayor, Ritt Bjerregaard, immediately starts the negotiations she has rejected for months and years:

“We are always open to dialogue with serious people who don’t use violence”,

as she states to a local news-channel, TV2Lorry. (Appendix69: m1)

December 20, 2007: Ground 69

On one of the darkest days in the year, the German artist, Angela Dorrer, organizes a collective performance, ‘Tales of Darkness’, following directly after the weekly demo:

“The Demo ended at the former site of the house which they now call Ground69. The organizers liked my idea and had asked in their demo-sms (organized in a kind of a flash-mob strategy) to bring Dark stories along and read them on one of the darkest days of the year’. So we read... Baudelaire: ‘Flowers of Evil / Abel and Cain’, T.S.Eliot: ‘The Waste Land’, Celan: ‘Death Fugue’, Allan Ginsberg, Peter Laugesen, Michael Strunge etc., and some people came up and improvised. I was impressed by their sincerity and honest anger. It is a very dark chapter in Copenhagen’s younger history. To me personally these people represent something like the good conscience of this city.”

(Appendix69: n)

Also included as an appendix is my sound-reconstruction of ‘Tales of Darkness’. Here, it is done as a collage of readings by 4 performance artists and poets:

Olof Olsson reads Allen Ginsberg
Claus Handberg reads Peter Laugesen, Celan og Claus Handberg
Stine Marie Jacobsen reads Beaudelaire
Frans Jacobi reads Mikael Strunge og Kim Larsen

Sound collage by Martin Kern (Appendix ..)

Spring 2008: Blue Garden

Discreetly, a group of activists occupies an unnoticed lot in between two buildings on Åboulevarden and design the temporary ‘Blue Garden’ – a kind of anarchistic park open for everyone. (Appendix69: o)

May - July15 2008: Refshalevej

In a spontaneous collective action, a large group of activists occupies a whole street behind Christiania, the old hippie free city. As the occupied area lies in an unclear legal zone in between the authority of the City administration and the military, it takes a while before the authorities react. As spontaneous as it started, the occupiers stay, and soon a new mini-society evolves. The activists call themselves ‘The Upbuilders’. They release a press statement, and now the occupation is a topic of public debate. The occupation expands and consolidates. A source talks of “a buzz of reggae, free socializing and total summer”. The UpBuilders make a formal application to the City Administration for continuing the experiment until September. In July the application is rejected, and the City of Copenhagen and the police collaborate in the eviction of the settlement. In a few hours one summer morning, the entire environment of social experimentation is erased. The UpBuilders disappear as fast and spontaneously as they appeared. (Appendix69: p)

The occupation of Refshalevej is the topic of the performance ‘On Water’ (AoR 3.3.)

July 1, 2008: Dortheavej 61

After hard and extended negotiations between the Mayor of Copenhagen, The Jagtvej 69 Foundation and the Youth House Movement, the City of Copenhagen has agreed to provide the Movement with a new house. The new house, that is found after a long list of proposed buildings has been rejected by the various parts, is given to the new users in a ceremony on July 1st. Apparently a solution to the paradoxical demands has been found: The City provides the house for free, AND the users have

complete autonomy, and the internal collective meeting, the Monday Meeting, has full powers of decision. The first act of the activists is to hang a banner from a window in the new house: STILL NO FUCKING THANKS TO THE SYSTEM! (Appendix69: q)

Violence versus Militant (3.1.4.2.)

The word violence is a key term in the debate on direct action. It was Tommy, an activist who helped me organize this performance at the new Youth House, who really made me understand the various positions on this, as we were writing the press release for the performance together. He made me realize that the use of the word 'violent' is already biased. He preferred the word 'militant' or 'confrontational'. As seen in the 'N30 Black Bloc Communiqué by ACME Collective' the demarcation between violence and non-violence is marked differently in the activists' circles than in society at large. ACME differentiates between private property and personal property:

"The premise of personal property is that each of us has what s/he needs. The premise of private property is that each of us has something that someone else needs or wants."³

Destruction of private property is not violence, since private property is part of the capitalist repression. It is rather a redistribution of functions. In society at large and in the media this is different, destruction of private property is clear violence, it's illegal and it's unethical. Already here a grey zone is opened up, a field of actions that is viewed completely differently by the two parts of the conflict. In the activist milieu surrounding The Youth House, there is a quite tough ethical stance on violence and repression. The vegan groups, for instance, consider killing animals for food violence, there are tough stances against commercialism, homophobia, class and gender related repression. So it's not because there is a general lack of ethical standards that the so-called violence appears so often in the struggles of these movements – it is because the demarcation is defined differently for political reasons. The militant activism is partly about marking this political territory. To redefine functions in an area of society seen as unethical and repressive. Another aspect is to challenge or - more accurately - to reveal the monopoly on violence given to the police by the state. By engaging in direct confrontation with large, armed police forces, the police is provoked to obviously violent behavior. Thereby an image of the violent police is created. An example of a successful action in this latter sense is the G13-action that is the topic of the performance 'G13greenredturquoiseyellow'. The problem with this strategy of revealing the violence monopoly of the police is, though, that often, maybe even in most cases, the activists are themselves framed as violent by the media and a public sphere that doesn't share the activists' views on violence. In any case, it is interesting to see how the use of words becomes a major factor in the struggles between the police and these movements. The words are used to frame the opponent in various ways – here it is the word 'violent' that stigmatizes the opponent and renders any rational argumentation from that side impossible. On a larger international scale, we can see how the word 'terror' is used in a similar way to stage an opponent as somebody whom we don't negotiate with, somebody who is evil to such a degree that all human rights are suspended.

On the other hand, this kind of framing the enemy is mirrored in activist circles. In her study of the 'Forms and temporality of left radical politics in northern Europe' the anthropologist Stine Krøyer describes how the police forces are often degraded to a non-human status in the internal rhetoric of the activists:

"What kind of beings are the police? The stories do not only convey a picture of an unaccountable police who may resort to either trickery or violence to get

the upper hand in a situation, but activists also often seriously doubt their humanity. I talked to another activist, Katrine (...), about the legitimacy of different means in the street, and how this depends upon the particular situation and the injustice committed. She said:

“Of course nobody believes that a bomb is OK. The boundaries [of what is acceptable] are read between the lines: not [damage to] people, but materials, and cops [police] who – at least to some people – are not really human, at least in this context. They are definitely an army who is the enemy, right?”⁴

In the grey zone between the various definitions of violence, not only material private property can be attacked and destroyed, even the police force in itself can be framed as an ok target. This de-humanizing is of course a psychological tool in the creation of an obvious enemy, but it also follows as a logical mirroring of the sci-fi-like aesthetics of the combat gear and the choreographed formations of the police forces. Stine Krøier also recalls a confrontation between activists and police, where in the midst of battle a chant emerges from the crowd of activists: ‘We are humans, what are you? We are humans, what are you?’

In this sense, a constant battle of terming the other part as the enemy is going on. By using the word ‘militant’ instead of ‘violent’, though, the struggles are described as an equal fight between equal parties. Equal parties with equal rights to define the territory where the struggle is taking place. As we saw in the section on ‘Show of Force’ in ‘A Short Course in Realism from the Perspective of the Police’ a large part of the operational strategy of the police is about defining the field of battle as theirs and theirs only:

“SHOW OF FORCE is ultimate. There is nothing to negotiate. Everything will happen as commanded by the police.”⁵

What we see here is thus a struggle, not only on the ground as a struggle for territories, but also a struggle of language, a struggle for the right to define what is going on; a struggle of where the border between accepted militancy and unacceptable violence lies. A struggle for the monopoly on violence, generally issued by the state to the police.

As Tommy argued, it is important for the activists to define their own rules of engagement. This re-definition of the border between acceptable political gestures and illegal violent destruction creates a dissension; the ruling order of the state is threatened. The activists break the law, but do it in a claim for another moral standard than the normative ethics expressed in the media and by society at large. This concept of politics as a confrontational civil disobedience closely resembles Jacques Rancière’s discussion of Politics versus Policing:

”A *political* dispute concerns the very existence of politics as distinct from police. Unlike *juridical* disputes, which take place within the police order, *le litige politique* brings politics proper into existence by introducing a veritable dissension that splits in two the shared world of the community.”⁶

Militant/confrontational activism challenges certain juridical laws in society – private property or the state’s monopoly on violence. These laws are presented by the state

as universal facts, but the activist attack reveals them as constituted by moral conventions that are up for discussion. By insisting on confrontation as politics, the activists create a political dissension. In terms of Rancière, militant activism forces 'politics proper' into the normative policing of representational democracy.

The attempts from the police and the politicians to denounce the activists as violent troublemakers can be seen as society's attempt to protect the police order.

Again, the militant action is performed. The dissension is created by performing another view on, for instance, private property. The 'split in the shared world of the community' is very direct. The challenge to the ruling order is acted out directly by destroying various symbolic manifestations of private property, i.e. smashing the facades of banks and certain chain stores, burning cars etc. In the temporal interstice that this performance creates, another moral codex exists for a moment. It is this performative intrusion into the normative policing order, Rancière calls 'politics proper'. Tommy also referred to militancy as Direct Action. Direct Action doesn't discuss politics, Direct Action performs politics in a direct confrontation with the policing order of representational democracy.

Such an attempt at maintaining the policing order is treated more directly in the script/performance 'Climate/Kettle'.

Active Time versus Dead Time (3.1.4.3.)

The Danish anthropologist, Stine Krøier, develops her ideas of Active Time from investigations into the social life of The Youth House. She discusses the notion of 'autonomy' and this term is a key in the arguments on both sides of the conflict.⁷

By the outside world, by the politicians involved in the conflict, and by society at large, as it is expressed in public debate on the conflict, the Youth House Conflict is first and foremost seen as a generational conflict. From both sides of the public debate, The Youth House activists are described as 'young' and their behavior is seen as part of 'becoming adult'. Those against The Youth House - the right-wing politicians, the leader of The Fatherhouse, Ruth Evensen, and other public voices - argue that their behavior is unacceptable and that it is the failure of their parents to restrict them in an orderly manner that is the main problem; the activists are seen as irresponsible teenage troublemakers acting out the lacking control of their parents. The supporters of The Youth House and The Youth House Movement - left-wing politicians, emerging groups of parents-supporter groups (i.e. Parents Against Police Violence) and other public defenders of the movement - also use 'youth' as a central argument. Here it is the basic rights of the coming generation to experiment with various lifestyles, and to a certain amount of rebellious behavior as part of their coming of age, as part of their initiation into adult life, that is the argument.

In both cases, autonomy is seen as individual and closely related to the formation of an adult self. As Krøijer writes:

"In the public debate, the activists were depicted as young troublemakers who were expected to acquire autonomy and status as adult members of society by going through a process of 'finding themselves'.⁸

When I was lurking around the demonstration at Skt Hans Torv, feeling 'a bit too old and a bit too well-off in the midst of all this rebellious – well, yes – youth' it was an emotional expression of exactly that view on the activists: They are young and in a process of finding themselves, and I am adult, I have been through that process myself, and I am here to support them in exercising the right to be young – young, rebellious and chaotic.

But, as Krøijer argues, crucial points are missing in this debate. First of all, quite a large part of the activists in The Youth House Movement aren't that young. Yes, there are teenagers taking part in the activities inside The Youth House and in the riots afterwards, but large parts of the Movement are adults who very consciously choose this kind of activism and this kind of struggle. Then most participants in the public debate, no matter which side they are on, are quite ignorant of the activists' own discourse in general. Following from the definition of the activists as 'young' - either 'spoiled young troublemakers' or 'creative youth' – is a general attitude that the young activists are not serious in their political claims. The radical critique of society at the core of the movement is not recognized or taken seriously by any of the sides in the public debate.

Stine Krøijer argues for a temporal understanding of autonomy "tied to the common activities that activists are absorbed by" inside The Youth House:

”The particular form of sociality found in The Youth House departed from entirely individualist notions of autonomy by depicting individual freedom and creativity as the offspring of a collective space of autonomy.”⁹

In these social practices, in the activism – organizing of punk concerts, running the vegan kitchen, restoring the house, organising the anarchist bookshop and taking active part in meetings built on consensus democratic processes – she detects a collective form of autonomy. The two main duties in The Youth House – to be active and to be engaged – are political in themselves. If you are actively taking part in the day-to-day running of the activities in the house you are political. The activities are political in themselves. What is really interesting is that the activists, the individual persons, don't initiate the activities, they are rather absorbed into the activities. The activities or actions form a social space that a person can become part of by being active. Instead of seeing these actions as determined by the spatial circumstances they are taking place in, Krøijer looks at the temporal circumstances of these activities. This is what she calls Active Time. Active Time is defined by the collective activity:

”People become activists by becoming engaged, absorbed or involved in common activity. Against this background, we can define as autonomy the temporal space of social relations that opens up when activists are engaged in common activities which extends the concept from one relating to physical space. Better even, the space of social relation can be conceptualized as an autonomous bracket or interstice, that is, an interval of active time in the all-encompassing dead time of capitalism.”¹⁰

An activist is a person who are active – not active in just any kind of action, but in a certain set of common activities that defines and constitutes a new social space and reconfigures ”norms, values and social relations”. These activities are political in themselves – they are ”world-making procedures”, implying ”that a new world comes into view.”

I will go deeper into Active Time later, in the performance 'Climate/Kettle' that is partly an attempt at re-enacting a certain version of Active Time for a short period of time. For now, two questions remain to be discussed: How can the activists be absorbed by the common activity – how is it that in a sense, it is the activity and not the activists that is active? And what separates these activities, the actions in Active Time, from other kinds of normal activities?

”Activism (...) depends on being involved in common activities and thus has a radical unchosen quality: it was talked of in a passive voice as something you are either absorbed by (bliver optaget af) or become engaged in (bliver engageret i). This very widespread way in which activists talked about how they became involved implies that the person is seen as the recipient of the action rather than its initiator. Following this understanding, activism is less a reflection of the existence of an intentional agent pursuing political goals, than something defined by the common activities which persons are absorbed by.”¹¹

The common activities are crucial here. It is the activity that defines the activism. The term Direct Action has to do with this. The political is defined by the action, not the other way around, as one would normally think. But then, what separates this action

from other kinds of action? The action is a 'figuration' of a 'new world' or of 'another world' or, as Krøijer states, of 'the future'. I will come back to the idea of the future in 'Climate/Kettle', but what about 'figuration'?

The various actions or activities the activists are being absorbed by – "for example through decision-making procedures, in cooking a vegan meal or in organizing an action together" – are political figurations. Krøijer doesn't use the often used anarchist term 'pre-figuration', meaning that an action can be a kind of model activity for another society to come, i.e. after the revolution. She uses the term 'figuration', implying that this activity is now, it is not pre- anything to come, it is a reality in itself, now as it happens. But it is still a figuration of something. It has an image-quality, in the sense that it is an activity that has a symbolic or political meaning. The activity represents a world-view, an attitude towards something. It makes a difference. It creates a difference. The action constitutes a difference from the rest of society. And it does so, as it happens in time. It is temporal. The difference only exists as an interstice in time. The activity has to be performed in time.

For example cooking a vegan meal; it is not only cooking a meal without any content from animals involved, it is an activity that represents an attitude and a worldview. Cooking a vegan meal is a political act. A gesture.

So we have a figuration – a kind of image – and this figuration has to be performed to create an interstice in time, to constitute a difference. The participants are performing these figurations and are thereby becoming activists. In the film 'Get Rid of Yourself' that I will come back to in the last commentary in this chapter, Werner von Delmont uses a similar passive description of the Black Block activists:

"You see, they made it. They were made, but why – if they are made – why are they so confused?"¹²

'They were made'? I was wondering why he was using this passive form 'they were made', but they too are performing images as political figurations, and they too are being made by these figurations. It seems an important point that the participants are becoming activists by performing the figurations of difference. To enter Active Time you have to take active part in the common actions, constituting the Active Time.

It was only in the short moment I was myself taking active part in the struggle for the survival of The Youth House – up there in the small room with my two partners in crime – I was able to connect to the common social space of that struggle. If only for a short moment and only as an emotional rush, still it 'made me'; it changed my conception of the movement and of activism in general, even though it has taken me a long time to understand.

In Love? Part One (3.1.4.4.)

In the discussion organized after the performance at The New Youth House, my first question to the audience was if the term 'in love' made any sense speaking about activism and protests. The question sparked a long debate, where most participants in various ways rejected the idea that activism, even militant activism, could be compared with 'being in love'. Most participants in the discussion argued that 'in love' was an all too positive feeling to fit the state they had been in during the riots. Words like rage, sorrow, anger or passion was used as being more fitting. In general, though, emotional expressions were used to describe the reasons for the collective struggle. This confirms my idea that a large part of the engagement in such struggles has an emotional character.

Henrik Have - the poet who was reading the text 'In Love' in the performance – proposed an understanding of the the text that defined 'being in love' as something completely different from 'inferior nice feelings between two young people', and instead saw it as an incomplete attempt at formulating that moment of apotheosis, when the rage of the riot clears away any kind of context, when the protesting person is finally free, and that this moment is felt through the body:

"I think the writer tries to work towards a description of a climax (and I don't mean an orgasm) in that moment of fighting - in that moment where we can rule out any kind of goo, any kind of moral or emotional thoughts, because they have no meaning whatsoever in a people's uprising. There, in revolt, he finds himself as a free being, totally free, not subject to anything (but one who can't go any further in any kind of liberation, because that would mean death). That moment he experiences as a physical body. And this bodily experience he calls 'in love'." ¹³

The use of 'in love' as a metaphor points to the experience that revolutionary freedom is experienced as the presence of the body, and in this sense resembles the sexual act. This analogy between 'in love' and 'sex' was criticized quite strongly by other participants, and even by Henrik Have himself, but if we think of the term 'in love' as a metaphor (in a pop-song), maybe the quest is to figure out what is meant by the use of this metaphor.

Only at the end of the discussion of 'in love', the idea of protests as emotional and physical phenomena was contested; comparing the 69-activism with football hooliganism, one of the activists present argued that activism was quite different and couldn't be seen as purely emotional expressions, collective feelings of adrenaline rush in the fight against the police, but were to be understood in political terms as well. Without a political framing and a political staging of such events, they are meaningless. The hard struggles in the 69-movement become completely underestimated, if they are seen only as such 'letting off steam', a collective adrenaline-valve, completely identical with mere hooliganism. 'Letting off steam' is also one of the common descriptions of protests used by the police and the politicians.

This last argument resembles an argument I made on transcendence and violence in the commentary 'Transcendence? Violence? The Aesthetics of Resistance':

”.. This shattering and exorcising of the capitalist spell is both real and symbolic, but the two levels are dependent on each other. The real action can only be justified, because it has a symbolic meaning, and the symbolic meaning only has an effect when it is actualized by being performed in the real.”¹⁴

It is only when the rage and its physical expression in street-fighting, and maybe even destruction, is inscribed in a symbolic system of meaning that it becomes a political act. The collective emotional states have to be linked to a symbolic, political discourse – the emotionally charged performance has to be staged as a political image to become meaningful.

‘The Apotheosis of Revolt’ introduced in the discussion by Henrik Have is also found in the film ‘Get Rid of Yourself’ to which the next commentary is devoted. In the film an activist describes the riot as an orgy:

“...if I must define an orgy, I’d say it happens when one person or another starts breaking the links between affects and gestures, affects and words, and then everyone else joins in.”

The total freedom Have describes is here described as a collective becoming. As such, it’s not only a liberating bodily emotion experienced in the ultimate moment of revolt; it is a political goal in itself. Individual subjects are dissolved into ‘whatever singularity’, a new open collectivity. As one activist says in the film:

“.....I become a whatever singularity. Everything that isolates me as a subject, as a body endowed with a public configuration of attributes – I feel it dissolve, bodies fray at their edges, at their limit, they blur little by little, I achieve a new nakedness – that’s what the need for communism is. The need for nocturnal spaces, where we can find each other beyond our qualities.”

Here the shattering of the ‘public configuration of attributes’ – the normative identity offered us by society – is political in itself. In the apotheosis of revolt, the activists find each other, freed from normative expectations and prefigured qualities. It is in this collective sense, in this collective becoming something new, that the metaphor of ‘in love’ is to be understood.

Get Rid of Yourself (3.1.4.5.)

“They say, “Another world is possible.” But we do not want another world, another order, another justice: another logical nightmare. We do not want any global governance, be it fair, be it ecological, be it certified by Porto Allegre. We want THIS world. We want this world as chaos. We want the chaos of our lives, the chaos of our perceptions, the chaos of our desires and repulsions. The chaos that happens when management collapses. Capitalism defeated traditional societies because it was more exciting than they were, but now there is something more exciting than Capitalism itself: its destruction.”¹⁵

With their film 'Get Rid of Yourself', the New York- and Paris-based artist collective, Bernadette Corporation, delivers the by far most convincing artistic portrayal of the Black Bloc and the 'apotheosis of revolt' discussed in previous commentaries. The film is made during and in the aftermath of the 2001 protests against the G8 Summit in Genoa in collaboration with Le Parti Imaginaire, the group of post-Situationist militants and intellectuals behind the magazine, Tiqqun, and The Invisible Committee, presented in 'A Short Course....', note 13. The text above scrolls past the title sequence and can be read as the thematic undertitle of the film. 'Get Rid of Yourself' is a visual and theoretical meditation on destruction as the favoured tool of political action by the Black Bloc. The radical thing about this film is that it so directly admits to the 'excitement of destruction'. From the opening sequence of ornamented images of the World Trade Center collapsing on 9/11 to the exalted smashing of an ATM machine with a heavy hammer, the film unashamedly describes the exciting joy of destroying the symbolic features of a capitalism on the verge of dying. Through a series of reflections on their experiences and strategies in the riots by a group of Black Bloc activists, the film also gives an insight into how the violent riot is seen from within, from the other side of the massive staging of the 'violent rebel' that the Black Bloc is treated to by society in general.

The cityscape of Genoa has been transformed into a reality event by the heavy security measures taken by the authorities, trying to protect the G8 Summit. But as the Black Bloc moves through the city in scattered formations, this pre-described scenario is fragmented and split up:

“We advanced through the city, not knowing where to go. Sometimes we blocked the streets to keep the police away. We put up barricades for protection using trash containers we found in the street. We set them on fire. And then we would move on. People were looting all the shops along the streets. Newsstands, real estate offices, travel agencies. Breaking everything, burning cars.”¹⁶

In this new terrain, the value systems break down and the rules of consumerism are suspended:

“..... It's very strange, the store's shelves without any lighting, the darkness. You get the impression of stepping into a territory that's familiar and at the same time totally bizarre. It's like going into a cinema, but there's no movie playing. The lights remain half on, as if something will be ending or starting. It was just like that when I was in the supermarket. Really odd. No cops, no security guards, no cashiers, nothing at all. Just darkness, and all the products you can barely see, with plenty of people around, taking

whatever they want. It's a funny experience. You know, when you're in a normal supermarket under normal conditions, sometimes there's this little voice that wakes up inside you, and it says: "All this could be different." And maybe then you start to sneak things into your pockets, because the rules of consumerism are just too stupid to deal with." ¹⁷

In the suspension of the prescribed scenario, the state of the subject changes, something beyond the subject unfolds:

"Well I think it's the moment where there is no more scenario. No prescribed scenario, as to which objectives, which direction to go, or what to confront. There's a moment when you arrive at these kinds of situations with some people you know, friends, people you meet, chance encounters. And then you begin to lose them, because the action makes everybody scatter. It's at that point that you feel something that goes beyond you. You're no longer a subject, the points of reference are lost. And then it's about what you observe around you and the way you begin to imitate what's happening. In my opinion, that's the improvisational element."

This is the crucial point, the moment when reality is loosened from pre-description. Even perception is altered, and the situation is experienced in another way:

"What's more is that you don't see much in these moments. You don't have a wide field of vision. There's a general opacity, because everyone's masked, the cops as well as the rioters, plus there's the tear gas, and also there's the opacity of the crowd. And so the greater part of perception of what was going on was organized by sound."

In the film there is a sequence where this kind of perception is imitated. For a few minutes the image is completely dark, almost pitch black, but there is a dramatic soundscape evolving – shouts, sirens, crashes; the sound of street-fighting – and in a sense it feels closer and more real than other parts of the film, where we see scenes of combat between police and rioting youth. So, we are presented with an altered perception, an altered reality:

"If I must define the old world, I'd say it's a way of linking affects to gestures, affects to word. It's a sentimental education that we've had enough of. And if I must define an orgy, I'd say it happens when one person or another starts breaking the links between affects and gestures, affects and words, and then everyone else joins in."

The riot is an orgy. The coding of affects are broken – this resembles the description of 'aesthetic transcendence' I attempted in note 11 in 'A Short Course...':

"The poetic re-claiming of functions are recreating the world around us, making it accessible for direct experience. This is the aesthetics of resistance."

"....and then everyone else joins in": These aesthetics are always described as collective. Individual subjects are dissolved into 'whatever singularity':

".....I become a whatever singularity. Everything that isolates me as subject, as a body endowed with a public configuration of attributes – I feel it dissolve,

bodies fray at their edges at their limit, they blur little by little, I achieve a new nakedness – that's what the need for communism is. The need for nocturnal spaces, where we can find each other beyond our qualities.”

The film flickers between scenes of chaotic street-fighting and mundane, calm scenes from a seaside suburbia, where the activists from *Le Parti Imaginaire* and *Bernadette Corporation* relax and reflect on the previous insurrection. This trivial suburban setting gives the film a melancholy atmosphere that adds to the feeling of being trapped inside a set of prescribed configurations that is described in the testimonies of the activists. But in this melancholia, there is a certain beauty; at one point we see a young couple setting fire to a pink parasol in front of a Mediterranean sunset. A sad, funny image of a lifestyle burning out.

“This attempt to freeze the unpredictable corpse of my becomings between the veils of an identity. The attempt to convert me to the religion of the coherence I do not choose. The *oikos*. I need to become anonymous in order to become present. The more anonymous I am, the more present I am.”

Everyone in and around ‘Get Rid of Yourself’ are anonymous to various degrees. *Bernadette Corporation* is the collective name of a group of artists, never named directly in any of their productions. *Le Parti Imaginaire* is a loosely assembled group of activist philosophers, producing among other things the magazine *Tiqqun*, also never defined directly as the work of any specific persons. And the voices in the film, reading out their testimonies, are completely anonymous; we don't know who they are, if they are members of *Bernadette Corporation*, *Le Parti Imaginaire* or the *Black Bloc*, if they are fictitious or real. We don't know if they are any of the persons we see in the images, if the voices we hear speaking belong to the same persons who have written the testimonies. But seen together, as in this film, all these people portray an attitude, a certain attention. In connection with her work on ‘Active Time’, Stine Krøyer talks about ‘style’ as a defining political tool; the political is not to be found in arguments or ideology –the political is to be found in the style of action chosen in a given situation. Here, style appears all over the film, in its harsh aesthetics, in the wild editing, and in the fragments of fashion-shots that are interspersed with the riot-scenes as emblems of the empire the rebels seek to destroy. Style is *Tiqqun*:

“Becoming attentive to the *Tiqqun* place of things, of beings. To their *eventness*. To the stubborn silent edge of their own temporality. To open up spaces where the act we commit is no longer assignable to a given body. Where bodies rediscover the ability to perform a gesture. The all-knowing distribution of metropolitan dispositives. Computers, cars, schools, cameras, telephones, hospitals, television, sports, cinema, etc. have stripped from them, by recognizing them, by immobilizing them, by making them turn and avoid, by making the body exist separately from the head. To liberate space liberates us one hundred times more than any free space does.”

In this last sentence we might find an explanation of the curious character of The Youth House Movement. Why did this movement swell to thousands after The Youth House was demolished? And why did these thousands of active participants in the Thursday demonstrations and in the other large scale protests suddenly disappear into the blue, when the new Youth House was finally established? How come that the Movement only existed, really existed, temporarily in the interval between the two Youth Houses? It might be as obvious as this: “To liberate space liberates us one

hundred times more than any free space does.” Only the struggle for a new Youth House, the struggle for more liberated spaces, was really liberating.

This continuous liberation of space resembles very closely the becoming I discussed in my introduction:

“In his introduction to “Robespierre or ”the Divine Violence of Terror”, Slavoj Žižek quotes Gilles Deleuze: ”They say revolutions turn out badly. But they're constantly confusing two different things, the way revolutions turn out historically and people's revolutionary becoming.””¹⁸

Is this 'revolutionary becoming' or 'becoming the people' as Žižek puts it, what happens in the exciting destruction of prescribed scenarios and capitalist values, in the undetermined physical presence of the riots? When the configuration of subjectivity dissolves, when the 'links between affects and gestures, affects and words' are broken? At the 'point where you feel something that goes beyond you'? In these moments, disguised and dressed in black, the activists of the Black Bloc lose individual identity and become anonymous: “The more anonymous I am, the more present I am.”

The American sociologist, Georgy Katsiaficas, calls the revolutionary becoming the 'eros-effect'.¹⁹ I discuss this in the performance 'Silent Stand'. Here, it is enough to compare this to the remarks made by Henrik Have in the discussion following 'Revolution By Night' – that the 'apotheosis of revolt' is experienced as a purely bodily presence, and that this presence must be described in sexual – erotic – terms. In the anonymous presence of destruction and looting, the bodies 'rediscover the ability to perform a gesture'. And it is this state of collective bodily becoming that can be termed 'revolutionary becoming'. The riot is an orgy.

As another reflective layer in the film, we meet two quite odd characters, both caught in a state of 'becoming other'. The famous actress, Chloe Sevigny, is rehearsing various lines and sentences from the testimonies of the activists we hear in other parts of the film (some of them quoted here). She is still trying out various modes of tone, intonation and formulation. Of course her figure casts a little doubt back on the 'real' testimonies – are they also staged and fictional – but in my view, the really interesting function of her figure is the paradoxical way she embodies the process of becoming another person. In a sense, her rehearsals illustrate the kind of 'sentimental education' mentioned a couple of times elsewhere in the film. As every actor, she is rehearsing to become another. But because the statements she is learning are about shredding off subjective identity, shredding off the 'public configuration of attributes', the other whom she is rehearsing to become is a 'whatever', a body stripped of identity. So she is rehearsing to become anonymous. And we never see her completing this process; she is caught in the undetermined state of becoming.

The other character is the artist Stephan Dillemath, here acting as his alter ego, Werner von Delmont. Wearing a blond wig and a weird, sloppy halfmask, he looks strangely dressed up, also caught in-between himself and his persona. Like Chloe Sevigny he is present exactly in the zone between real person and fictive person. In the zone of becoming image.

Werner von Delmont is sitting by a pond, contemplating his blisters and criticizing 'the young people of today':

"They are a little bit too confused about their own – you know – what they are supposed to do. You see, they made it. They were made, but why – if they are made – why are they so confused? They are themselves, so astonished that they can do these things. And they have so much fun in doing it. But they miss a little bit more of intelligence. Strategic intelligence."

Asked about the violence, Werner von Delmont is very clear:

"It's not violence – smashing things. It's to create pictures, you know. You create pictures. (...) I mean, there were very good images yesterday. There was a whole underpass burning. The police couldn't go through. And all these things."

This is what he is looking for: strategic images. Images in which the rebels 'are being made'. It is when the activists 'rediscover the ability to perform a gesture' such images are made. In the gesture an image is being performed.

There is a dispute in the film between Delmont wishing for the youth to realize their 'being made', their becoming strategic subjects, and on the other hand the "potential of community based on a radical refusal of political identity" that Bernadette Corporation and Le Parti Imaginaire present as the topic of the film. Through the strange figure of Delmont, this dispute is presented as generational, which is also orchestrated in the harsh rejection of the older generations of activists in other parts of the film.

This is also what is so hard to grasp in the activism of the Black Bloc: The radical lack of political ideology, the lack of any kind of rational argument. The politics of the Black Bloc is being performed in dramatic images of destruction. And the other world being produced by these images is to be sought inside the production of the images: it is already there, in the collective improvisations of the activists, in the eventness of the moments when 'the points of reference are lost', in the 'unpredictable corpse of becomings'.

The artistic language of 'Get Rid of Yourself' matches this; it is as raw, improvised and direct as the actions it portrays. In an abrupt, crash editing, various blocks of images, sounds, interviews are layered in a chaotic assemblage, filled to the brim with cheap video effects and harsh camera moves. The riot is an orgy. Get Rid of Yourself!

In Love? Part Two (3.1.4.6.)

“Everything dissolves. The civilized world is dead and you know what? I fucking don’t care - I am in love”.²⁰

It is this becoming through destruction I found so fascinating in the text ‘In Love’; it is formulated as a pop-song, with humour and catchy phrases, but the agenda is similar to the radicalism of ‘Get Rid of Yourself’: The exciting destruction of Capitalism. Here, after ‘Get Rid of Yourself’, I might even attempt my own interpretation of the use of the term ‘in love’ in that song: Isn’t loss of identity exactly what characterizes the person who has fallen in love? All of a sudden, one sees oneself as the object of the gaze of the beloved other, one’s identity is shattered, and all one hopes for is to become another, to unite with the beloved other, and become new. And there one is hanging, in-between identities, lost to one self and not yet found by that miraculous other. Hanging in-between reality and fiction, like Chloe Sevigny and Werner von Delmont, caught in becoming. This becoming, the becoming in ‘in love’, could be similar to the becoming an anonymous bodily presence in the apotheosis of revolt. In this sense ‘in love’ might not be such a bad metaphor after all.

The Youth House versus The Father House (3.1.4.7.)



September 2001 The Father House
ink and acrylic on paper
53x76cm
2008



Fall 1999 (for sale including 500 violent psychopaths from hell)
acrylic on banner
154x154cm
2008

Autumn 1999 – after a series of quarrels with the activists about a fire and the necessary restoration of Ungdomshuset, the city of Copenhagen decided to sell Jagtvej 69. The activists using the house would thereby be evicted. They on their

side reacted by hanging a highly satirical banner on the facade of the house: "FOR SALE INCLUDING 500 VIOLENT PSYKOPATHS FROM HELL". This text later on became one of the principal reasons for the religious sect The Fatherhouse to buy and destroy the house. My version of the banner is a half-size replica, made from an unclear photo of the original banner. Its a sculpture 'in between reproduction and ready-made' – a formula used several times throughout the 69 works in the exhibition '69scenes'.²¹ Its intended to give a double sense of 'the real event' and a museological artifact.

The banner provoked Ruth Evensen, head of the fundamentalist christian movement The Fatherhouse, immensely. She felt obliged to God to clean up, rinse out the evil of Ungdomshuset. In a slow but effective deceptive operation she managed to buy up the foundation which first bought the house from the city of Copenhagen in september 2001. The Fatherhouse is hierarchically centered around Ruth Evensen. Apart from Ungdomshuset their main themes are fights against homosexuality and free abortion. But the Ungdomshuset-case is by all means Ruth Evenesnes claim to fame, ad she is given almost unlimited speaking-time in the mainstream media.

My portrait of Ruth Evensen is made from a official portrait photo of her, found on the web-page of The Fatherhouse. The use of black background and white figure/foreground is inspired by the graffitti and banner design in and around Ungdomshuset. It also adds to the mask-like character of her face. Ruth disguised as The Father (or is it the other way around) on a mission from God – The Father, as a stand-in for the will of God, hunting and haunting the evil Youth – The Youth disguised as psykopaths from Hell. God has many faces. Hell has frozen over. Ghosts.

Notes:

¹ Ruth Evensen: Ruths beretning om Ungdomshus-sagen (uddrag af Ruth - det ik' slut), Ruth Evensen reading the chapter on The Youth House from her self-biography. Online at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=Z8LA9WjNB1c

² The occupation of the fortress is documented in the film: '500 Stenkastende Autonome Voldspsykopater fra Helvede / Squat 69', film by: Morten Revsgaard Frederiksen, Anders Hornstrup, Toke Gade Crone Kristiansen, David B. Sørensen (Copenhagen: Beofilm 2007)

³ N30 Black Bloc Communiqué by ACME Collective 10:48am Sat Dec 4 '99 A communiqué from one section of the black bloc of N30 in Seattle - <http://www.nocompromise.org/news/991204a.html> included here as Appendix 1.1.5.2.

⁴ Stine Krøijer: *FIGURATIONS OF THE FUTURE Forms and temporality of left radical politics in northern Europe*, PhD thesis (Copenhagen: Department of Anthropology, University of Copenhagen 2011). p. 182-183

⁵ Kai Vittrup: *OPERATION* (Copenhagen: Copenhagen Police 2003), p.97

⁶ Glossary of Technical Terms: Dispute (Le Litige) in Jacques Rancière: *THE POLITICS OF AESTHETICS* (London: Continuum 2004), p. 85

⁷ All quotes in note 9 are from: *Chapter 2: BECOMING ENGAGED: youth and interstices of active time in Ungdomshuset* in Stine Krøijer: *FIGURATIONS OF THE FUTURE Forms and temporality of left radical politics in northern Europe*, PhD thesis (Copenhagen: Department of Anthropology, University of Copenhagen 2011) p. 71-96

⁸ see note 7

⁹ see note 7

¹⁰ see note 7

¹¹ see note 7

¹² Werner von Delmont aka Stephan Dillemath in *Get Rid of Yourself*, Bernadette Corporation 2003, DV, 61 min, The transcribed text of the film is published by appliednonexistence as *PILFERED SERIES: TWO* at: http://appliednonexistence.org/?page_id=24, this quote at p.13

¹³ *REVOLUTION BY NIGHT* discussion AoR 3.1.2.1 (video documentation). The translation of Henrik Have's comments is done by Frans Jacobi.

¹⁴ From 'Transcendence? Violence? The Aesthetics of Resistance', Commentary 1.1.4.2.

¹⁵ *Get Rid of Yourself*, Bernadette Corporation 2003, DV, 61 min, featuring Chloe Sevigny and Werner von Delmont, distributed by Electronic Arts Intermix. Online viewing: http://www.archive.org/details/get_rid_of_yourself The transcribed text of the film is published by appliednonexistence as *PILFERED SERIES: TWO* at: http://appliednonexistence.org/?page_id=24

¹⁶ *Get Rid of Yourself*, Bernadette Corporation 2003, DV, 61 min, featuring Chloe Sevigny and Werner von Delmont, distributed by Electronic Arts Intermix. Online viewing: http://www.archive.org/details/get_rid_of_yourself The transcribed text of the film is published by appliednonexistence as *PILFERED SERIES: TWO* at: http://appliednonexistence.org/?page_id=24

¹⁷ *Get Rid of Yourself*, Bernadette Corporation 2003, DV, 61 min, featuring Chloe Sevigny and Werner von Delmont, distributed by Electronic Arts Intermix. Online viewing: http://www.archive.org/details/get_rid_of_yourself The transcribed text of the film is published by appliednonexistence as *PILFERED SERIES: TWO* at: http://appliednonexistence.org/?page_id=24

¹⁸ Slavoj Žižek : "Robespierre or the "Divine Violence of Terror" in: *Robespierre: Virtue and Terror* (London: Verso, 2007), pp. xxxiv – xxxv

¹⁹ George N. Katsiaficas: The Eros Effect (<http://www.eroseffect.com/articles/eroseffectpaper.PDF>)

²⁰ The last sentence in the song 'In Love', see note 10

²¹ "69scenes", Bendixen Contemporary Art, Copenhagen, 2008