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## THE CREATIVE FACTORY: COLLECTIVE CREATIVITY AND AUTONOMY IN THE NEOLIBERAL MACHINE OF CREATIVE INDUSTRIES

### Introduction: Genteel Capital Courtship

A maxim constantly repeated by the Ljubljana Mayor in the last few years has been “Ljubljana – the most beautiful city in the world”. The sentence condenses the dominant urbanistic managerial ideology of the Municipality of Ljubljana (hereafter MOL): the ideology of consumerist attractiveness. The grandiose urban plans following this directive are transforming the city into a postcard in order to send it and sell it, especially to the urban tourism industry which clings to the public image-making as well as to other formations of capital. The straightjacketing of the public space into lucrative, sterile, and disciplinary logic is not anything new. Yet some strategies of the neoliberal urbanism in city espoused with the reproduction of capital seem to be the new ones. Whereas the cultural consumption was fuelling the city’s symbolic economy[[1]](#footnote-1) for quite a while, the cities in the 21st century strain themselves to become areas of peculiar multifaceted production closely intertwined with consumption once again .This time they are shaping a pervasive marketing coalition between the cultural and art establishments, real estate speculators, service business, and city councils.

The contemporary urban tourism industry ceases to have the privileged sole position of the producer of surplus value in the metropolis. Instead, the neoliberal capital colonization is invading new spheres and ways of surplus extraction, while mimicking the ideological processes of gentrification under “new planetary vulgates”[[2]](#footnote-2), such as the territorial “creative milieu”[[3]](#footnote-3)or the metropolitan “creative city”.[[4]](#footnote-4) The proponents of such “new urban economy”[[5]](#footnote-5)tend to blindly follow Florida’s nostrum of the new paradigm for urban planning that can be found his all-encompassing predicament: “Human creativity is the ultimate source of economic growth”.[[6]](#footnote-6) The territorial intertwines with the cognitive colonization only to become a situated “creative economy” in the era of cognitive capitalism.

We can witness the entire trajectory of these processes through the case of a former bicycle factory in Ljubljana. Located in immediate vicinity of the city centre, the Rog factory operated until 1991, then remained closed and abandoned until 2006,[[7]](#footnote-7) when, after 15 long years of stagnation, the group TEMP, along with a conglomerate of other praxes and realities,[[8]](#footnote-8) reclaimed the factory for temporary use and brought the Fordist Frankenstein back to life. From 2010 onwards, the reappropriation of the commons was claimed. Ever since their liberation and reanimation, the spaces in Rog² present an open cultural, social, and political hub giving shelter to a multitude of autonomous collective political subjects[[9]](#footnote-9) as well as to a broad range of artists and sports enthusiasts practicing horizontal organization and communication on a daily basis.

In order to demonstrate how the paradigmatic shift to postfordist cognitive capitalism is taking place and form in Ljubljana, I divided the article into three sections. It starts by introducing the project based on a public-private partnership bearing the name Second Chance,then highlighting its initial intentions with the autonomous Rog and the neoliberal discourse while advocating creative industries, urban regeneration etc. After problematizing the premises of the “new urban economy” and of the designed emplacement of cognitive capitalism, the article focuses on pilot project RogLab which is seen as a pervasive creation of creative industries installed in the interim phase between the unveiling of the megalomaniac plans and their implementation by the owner of the factory, MOL. The third and concluding instance deals with the changed spatial design, showing the proposed publically financed gradual construction, or rather demolition, of the liberated Rog factory which has, in fact, the purpose of neutralization and eradication of the autonomous collective creativity in Rog, giving space to gentrification.

### The Public-Private Partnership Model as a Pan-European Paradigm of Gentrification: Second Chance

Starting with the year 2010, MOL’s endeavour to castrate Rog was wrapped inside a benevolent cellophane, launched under the name the Second Chance. The former Rog factory joined other postindustrial sites including the former AEG factory (Nuremberg), HALLE 14 of the former Cotton Spinning Mill (Leipzig), the tram depot (Krakow) and the Arsenale (Venice). In order to understand the vulgar slogan of Second Chance “from industrial use to creative impulse” we shall dwell directly on the project’s description:

[The slogan] [i]t is a vision of five European cities to transform a disused industrial site into a cultural and creative work and living space and continuing their revitalisation with sustainable concepts. […] Nuremberg, Leipzig, Venice, Krakow and Ljubljana work together[[10]](#footnote-10) to develop innovative strategies and concepts to upgrade their former industrial site to a key cultural linchpin of the city’s district. The cities face the same challenges of developing a heritage and former industrial sites. Even though the revitalisation process is at different stages in the five cities, the partners share the same questions, challenges, opportunities and goals. […][[11]](#footnote-11)

According to the initial plan, and through the private-public partnership model, the buildings would be levelled first to the ground, and then, once the ruins were cleaned up, the Centre of Contemporary Arts was to be planned on top. To complement this grotesque picture, the entire Rog’s surface (around 7,000 square meter) was to be split into private (80.69%) and public (19.31%) ownership, whereby the private “content” would comprise a residential (apartments, underground garages), hotel and business section, while the public part were to be exclusively reserved for *creative industries* (multi-purpose halls, exhibition surfaces, studios etc.).[[12]](#footnote-12) The logic behind the two bedfellows under neoliberalism is that the public would finance the private and the private would parasite on public benefits. The ideological premises nesting in the plan were in theapparent satisfaction of both sectors: the private sector with profit-making spaces and pseudopublic spaces as non-profit contents were to be designed for the public.

However, the unveiled case of the expropriation of the commons is far from being satisfactory. It is necessary to scale the whole problem on the level of new urban regime which does not necessarily cling any longer on the art world, as it symptomatically proposes to erect the Centre of Contemporary Arts as well as spaces for arts and culture to be featured inside. To expand a Hannah Arendt’s thought into the milieu of “creative capitalism”, the privatization of the public *and* the commons is intimately connected to the privatization of the political. And to put it differently, gentrification through art was complemented with the gentrification through “creativity”. The culturalization of capital under a new panacea for post-industrial sites means: creative “revitalisation through arts and culture”.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Generally speaking, gentrification can manifest in three forms: traditional, modern, and artificial.[[14]](#footnote-14) The traditional one is produced by exploiting historical and social “guardians of collective symbolic and cultural capital (the museums, the universities, the class of benefactors, and the state apparatus)”.[[15]](#footnote-15) The modern one is produced by exploiting the art world and urban subcultures as the artificial gentrification is a strategy generated by city councils through public campaigns which promote the creative city in order to attract investments and highly skilled workers. [[16]](#footnote-16) Concomitantly, the “[q]uality of urban life has become a commodity, as has the city itself, in a world where consumerism, tourism, cultural and knowledge-based industries have become major aspects of the urban political economy”.[[17]](#footnote-17)

What remains overshadowed is the mode of accumulation of the *collective symbolic capital*. This capital, after Slovenia’s transition to neoliberalism, was not exploited due to MOL’s active negation of the autonomous cultural production in Rog today. In this sense, neither squatters nor artists or other users of the postindustrial Rog had the role of “bridge gentrifiers”[[18]](#footnote-18), i.e. transitional tenants, who would be tolerated only until they raised property value. For example, in Lower East Side (New York City) “[t]he artists were pioneers of gentrification in this new frontier for the middle class, by creating an art scene and community, combining the use of their space for living, producing, performing and exhibiting.”[[19]](#footnote-19)

Instead of what Zukin[[20]](#footnote-20) termed “artistic mode of production”, the parasitism through which the Second Chance has been building upon its campaign, is availing to the emplaced and sediment collective symbolic capital. It also accumulated during the socialistic industrial era and strongly underlined the embedded collective memory. The “unique cultural assets”[[21]](#footnote-21) of the former Rog industrial complex are in fact just “[...] special marks of distinction that attach to some place, as they have a significant drawing power upon the flows of capital more generally.”[[22]](#footnote-22) Concisely, claims to the uniqueness yield monopoly rent.[[23]](#footnote-23)

I shall underline here another passage from the project’s description: “The cities face the same challenges of *developing a heritage and landmarked former industrial sites*”.[[24]](#footnote-24) The claim indicates that the accumulation of the *collective symbolic capital* would combine a symbolic musealisation of the localized “unique” socialist remains *with* the outlined cultural capital (the projected art spaces and institutions) *in order to*, lastly, pave the way for capital accumulation under the banner of creative industries. Thus, the traditional way of gentrification will intertwine the (pseudo)modern and the artificial form.

One of the premises of the pan-European Second Chance is therefore purely teleological: the cognitariat would superimpose the bygone proletariat which once laboured in these spaces spanning from shipbuilders to bicycle factory workers. What is a better way to illuminate the triumph of the bright “progressive” capitalism over the obscure “archaic” socialism? Here also could fit the statement of the MOL’s Head of Department for Culture expressed at the unveiling of the new plans (which will be discussed in more detail later). According to her, Rog will become a point of interest for the new generation of young architects and designers, which will “get in the city centre a space and tools for entering the labour market”.[[25]](#footnote-25)

Moreover, by perpetually referring to the *disused* and *(former) Rog factory* the Second Chance is not only imaginarily discarding the emplaced collective body from the past of a Yugoslav industrial flagship, but rather the recuperation is broadened onto the semantic level with a metonymy, castling the factory’s original denomination (i.e. Rog) and by continuously repeating the Rog’s (distorted) condition. The capitalist exploitation coated itself in “creativity” abandoning the division between former/present, as the case of Rog shows. The denial of this binarity is necessary, or else the legitimacy of subjectivities present within Rog would be acknowledged.

In this view, an left-out part of the Second Chance description is to be understood: “[These postindustrial sites are] the industrial estates who deserve this 2nd chance”.[[26]](#footnote-26) The positioning of the Second Chance in the linear continuation of the paternalistic logic of urbanism (the anthropomorphized discourse of giving estates a second opportunity)[[27]](#footnote-27) is actively denying the collective reappropiation of the space in 2006 as well as it is denying the ongoing manifold autonomous cultural, social, and political production being housed in the buildings.[[28]](#footnote-28) This attempt to revive a space already revived[[29]](#footnote-29)can signal only one thing: creative industries will lie on the ashes of autonomous collective creativity. One could go that far to delineate the latter as a fetishist urban necrophilia: the compulsive reuse of the moribund object-factory as a stimulus of capital consolation (or better yet, accumulation). It is an object to which either any of the current vivacity is apathetically negated, either to which the emancipating collective creativity will be institutionally euthanatized by turning it into an urban corpse – or only to be repossessed later. Once the collective creative capital failed to undergo capitalist valorisation, the only attraction left to the capital and managerial establishment is to cling to the cadaveric proletarian collective “body”.

Pointed out by Pasquinelli, Harvey’s *collective symbolic capital* can be conceived as another name for the “*capitalist exploitation of the commons* – a form of exploitation that does notneed violent enclosures”.[[30]](#footnote-30) Here the notion of violence deserves further attention. Ever since Rog’s reappropriation, MOL is intentionally leaving Rog in deficient circumstances, without the minimal material conditions; ever since the reappropriation the whole complex is functioning in abstraction of electricity.[[31]](#footnote-31) Rog’s users are quotidianly experiencing systematic exhaustion, longitudinal vegetation on their bodies, and, generally, the menace of eviction – all instances of subtle structural violence strongly calling into question the presumed no-violence-policy of capital exploitation.

Now I can focus on the postulation regarding the *exploitation of the commons.* We are faced with the notion of the exploited commons, which is easily applicable to the enunciated capitalistic mode of production as immaterial, pertaining to cognitive, affective labour. This appears be the position after the implementation of Second Chance, turning Rog from a closedown factory into an immaterial social factory. Again, according to the description the project’s intention is: “[...] to transform a disused industrial site in a *cultural and creative* *work and living space* [...]”.[[32]](#footnote-32) The phrase quintessentially comprises the concept of bio-political production, in which all spheres of social life are produced: “[...] post-Fordism and the immaterial paradigm of production adopt performativity, communication, and collaboration as central characteristics”.[[33]](#footnote-33) Perhaps this is an opportune time to fasten more particularly the pervasive creation of the creative industries.

### In the White Cube, a Simulacrum of the Creative Industries: RogLab Centre Pilot Project

The capital’s colonization of the public spaces and the commons once was exemplified in 2012 with the so called RogLab Centre Pilot Project. Installed as a plot investment of the Second Chance project and located on the embankment directly across the street from Rog, RogLab takes a shape of an entirely white cargo container. Here we have a double interpretation of an object pioneering the local creative industries, offering itself. The white container cannot be seen only as the advocate of the White Cube and thus flagging the penetration of the new “creative” urban economy; the container is simultaneously a prime example of a boxed up neoliberalism through which the mantra of free movements of goods, capital, services and people, is transmitted around the globe. By analogy with Giddens’ the conceptualization of the state as a territorial (bordered) power-container, RogLab strains in presenting itself as an unconfined “creative” power container and a dynamo for the creative economy:

RogLab is conceived as a production, educational and presentation space in a 30 m²‑container object. It is dedicated to activities in the fields of architecture, design and contemporary art, their mutual connecting and cross-sector collaboration (economy, education, science, environment, space…) as well as international networking.[[34]](#footnote-34)

RogLab’s spatial separation from the Rog building by being *outside* yet *in face of* it, does not mean its contents are hermetically encapsulated or, at first glance, antithetic to those nourished in Rog.[[35]](#footnote-35) Quite to the contrary: this act of colonization of the public space means as well the colonization of creativity by being the epistemological and material forerunner of the creative industries in the area. For example, RogLab is openly acknowledging the devastation of Rog; it promotes to be “an attractive mobile architecture [...] marking the beginning of the renovation of the former Rog factory. The pilot project will function as a small scale model of the future Rog Centre”.[[36]](#footnote-36)

Further, on the external surface of RogLab an imprinted characterization reads: “In the 3D workshop for fast prototyping, we help you *develop ideas into tangible products*”[[37]](#footnote-37) Thus, the neoliberal capitalist paradigm of productive knowledge is canalized into an applicable and vendible market form. “Neoliberalism,” asserts Harvey[[38]](#footnote-38) “[…] proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices.”

Taken together, Rog*Lab* can indeed be viewed as *labor-*atorial, a laboratorial materialization reflecting the intertwined processes of the capitalist rent parasiting on the productive commons,[[39]](#footnote-39) incorporation of existent subversion, commodification of autonomous collective creativity, and the (forerunner and justifier of) spatial usurpation.[[40]](#footnote-40) The paradigmatic workshop/art project “Socialdress” carried out in RogLab might be the utmost illustration of these processes *in vitro*. Championing the creative industries, the workshop sucked out the labour of unemployed women who were voluntarily embroidering clothes for several days:

This art project […] takes place in the form of a clothes and household fabrics fashion collection. The collection incorporates slogans from the recent Slovenian protests[[41]](#footnote-41) – the expression of the general public’s rebellion and dissatisfaction with the existing system. Modern embroidery machines will be used to embroider the selected slogans onto fabrics and clothes, thus empowering them. Traditional craft skills, modern technology, fashion, social engagement, activism and social entrepreneurship all join forces in this new interdisciplinary art project [...].[[42]](#footnote-42)

The machine of commodification, which mimics under the coat of benevolence and social responsibility, attempted to decontextualize and castrate the collective subversive potentiality of the uprisings by aestheticisation and banalization, vampirizing the free labour: “The [Socialdress] project promotes and supports sewing e.g. dress home-making. It transforms the sewing into an entertaining and useful social activity”.[[43]](#footnote-43) Here, the unpaid social cooperation, the mutual production, and interdisciplinary collaboration all go a step further from the individualism inherent to the anatomized precariat. The neoliberal machine does not base its agenda anymore on explicit exclusion, but rather on the controlled inclusion – preferably the collective one. In this vein, it is necessary to mention the emphasis of the Second Chance on the newly incarnated neoliberal species, who do not go under the name stockholders or shareholders but stakeholders instead. According to Marx’s general intellect or to Kropotkin’s mutual aid, a neoliberal counterpart is allocated and linked with the fabrication of consent through a Habermassian ideal communication and rational discourse. Throughout the practice of the Second Chance, the colonization of the commons goes hand in hand with the adoption of the formalized “inclusive bottom-up participatory” smokescreen.

### Gentrification Goes Public

What was to be witnessed in 2013 was another twist in the neoliberal municipal urban policies. In the explication of the changed spatial plan for Rog, under the heading “*Assessment of the situation, causes and aims why the document is necessary*” the scenario runs: since the initial blueprint was approved, the situation, especially economic, has been changing and the arrangement of Rog’s area to the extent of the previous spatial plan was no longer possible. In reality, no private investor was willing to take part in the Second Chance, thereby decelerating the entire process of the execution; indeed, an irony derived directly out of the global financial crisis. Neither the downfall of a private-public partnership or the subsequent resignation of capital did not bury the peculiar spatial voracity. Notwithstanding the financial deficit and the public debt, the construction pretence is now to be orchestrated by the municipality independently of the investments from the private sector.

Therefore, a changed spatial plan was proposed enabling the construction in several stages. More accurately, a seven-phased (re)construction is now being designed. In the first stage of the construction, the blueprint includes two crucial interventions: the “outside arrangement” around the central building *and* an underground garage overlapping with the position of almost all buildings on the territory of Rog.[[44]](#footnote-44) In all likelihood, the planned besiegement of the central building and the “outside arrangement” will manifest itself directly in the form of an internal reconstruction of the main factory outbuilding, leaving behind another “late capitalist hollow space”[[45]](#footnote-45)

As for the surrounding buildings without the historical preservation,[[46]](#footnote-46) which itself allows façadism— and the demolishment of the building’s interior yet leaving its exterior intact— these will be levelled to the ground, causing another symptomatic fenced urban void, filled at the best with gravelled parking spaces, as this profitable emptiness is the *modus operandi* for architectural shortfalls in the city. What would evidently distinguish it from other urban voids caused by the lack of investments is contained in the intention of transforming the building into a politically silent urban phantom. The eviction of users, the fencing off potential occupants, and seclusion are all practical strategies of de-politization. In other words, the complete resignation from the project remains unimaginable since gentrification operates in a broader urban context. With the restructuration into a “postindustrial creative site” though, the refashioned Rog factory will, at best, become the situated gravitational field for gentrification, as the process of gentrification will inevitably include the entire surrounding neighbourhood. (PHOTO)

### "Gentrification is class war"

The fundamental reason behind the repeatedly converted plans of demolishment of the liberated Rog factory area seems simple;[[47]](#footnote-47) communities “that swarm in Rog, are not dangerous for MOL because of the revitalization of [...] abandoned spaces, but because of the swarming of new and different forms of social activities, connections and collaboration”.[[48]](#footnote-48) The eradication and neutralization, discursive or violently material, of autonomous collective creativity, troubling the flows of capital, are inevitably inherent to wider processes of capital accumulation. For once, in the current condition, the extraction of monopoly rent as the business model in cognitive capitalism (Pasquinelli 2010) is obstructed. In the hegemonic notion of the collective creativity, we run into the creativity as ideological substitution for labour. The creativity as understood by the apologist of corporative creative industries has not become the Deleuzian becoming, but an ideological superstructure of labour and therefore exploitation.

Beuys’ famous claim fulfils itself in an odd manner – in the age of cognitive capitalism, elevating each and every individual into divinity, everyone is not an artist, but a *creator*. Fortunately, the repolitization of creativity and its emancipation from the neoliberal colonial deadlock are being collectively produced in factories of the Foucauldian insurrectional subjugated knowledge. The remaining question is whether one will hop on the moving train rushing through the urbanscape moved by these machines.
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